LIBRARY
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXVIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 1934 NUMBER 1007

Contents

The Week 141

Editorials

Marching Toward Hell 144
Business Chases Its Tail 146
The Supreme Court Eats Crow 146
More Than Mob Terror 148

General Articles

Six Months of the N.R.A. .....
Jonathan Mitchell and William P. Mangold 149
In the Land of Cotton .....Bruce Bliven 152
Off to a Concentration Camp .....Verne Andrews 155
Your Hand and Mine (verse) ..Valentine Ackland 157
Washington Notes .....T. R. B. 157
Other People's Money .....John T. Flynn 158
Garden Music .....Paul Rosenfeld 160
Genesis, 19:8 .....Otis C. Ferguson 160

Correspondence 161

Books in Review

Adventurous America .....George Soule 163
Ruskin Psychoanalyzed .....Philip Wheelwright 164
Prelude to Hitler .....George E. Novack 164
Dewey on Thought and Action .....Sidney Hook 165
Farrell's Best Novel .....Fred T. Marsh 165
Esculapians .....Harold Ward and David Beres 166
Books in Brief 167

The Week

THE stock-exchange-control bill is certain to be modified in some respects before it is passed. Some modifications can be made without doing a great deal of harm—the question of what restrictions should be imposed upon margins, for instance, and whether they should be flexible, is one of judgment and permits of adjustment. The point at which it would be disastrous to surrender, however, is the specification of the agency which is to carry out the regulation. Unless this is an independent, wholly governmental one, like the Federal Trade Commission, exchange regulation might as well be thrown into the discard at the beginning. The chief feature of the bill which the stock exchange itself is promoting is that it sets up a control agency which the exchange itself could largely control. This is merely a substitute for its long expressed desire that regulation should be kept in its own hands. Nothing is more obvious than that the exchange will never properly regulate itself, because adequate regulation would destroy a large part of the business of its members. The object of stock-exchange regulation is to reduce speculation to the minimum consistent with the proper functioning of an exchange. The object of stock-exchange members is to increase speculation to a maximum, for their profits depend on the volume of trading and the rapidity and amplitude of its swings.

A GREAT many of the chief officials of America's leading corporations have presumably been given some unhappy days lately through the publication of their salaries and bonuses for the four years 1929-33 inclusive. Everyone knew that these gentlemen were handsomely paid; but few outside the charmed circle realized how little most of them had suffered financially even in the darkest days of the depression. While bonuses have melted away with profits, salaries have stubbornly resisted the downward tendency. They have been reduced only slightly, or have remained the same, or in many instances have actually been increased to compensate these gentry for the shrinkage in other types of remuneration. Unless we are badly mistaken, publication of these salaries will have much the same effect on public opinion as the news that J. P. Morgan and others like him have escaped payment of income tax. It is of no avail to argue that these salaries are really small in comparison with the gross business done, or that they are necessary to ensure the loyal efforts of the recipients, or to advance any of the other usual buncombe on this subject. The blunt fact remains that practically all of these companies have reduced or eliminated earnings to their stockholders; have cut the wages of their poorest paid employees; have mercilessly discharged workers by the thousand. It is now revealed that in each case the little group of insiders who have taken these actions have at the same time carefully feathered their own nests. Their utter callousness and lack of any sense of social responsibility are demonstrated again—unforgettably.

TESTIMONY from all parts of the country indictates that the air-mail incident has definitely hurt the administration. Washington is conscious that this is so, as is evidenced by the steps recently taken. Mr. Roosevelt is putting all possible pressure upon Congress to get the bill passed permitting restoration of the service to private companies under new conditions; and in the meantime, he has cut down

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the mail service to a point where safety of Army fliers is the first consideration. So far as we can judge, cancellation of the contracts with the private companies met general approval; but the deaths of ten Army aviators in less than a month have shocked the country and led to the conclusion that someone must have bungled. There is no proof, however, that this was the President. Presumably he asked the Army aviation authorities whether they were prepared to fly the mail; and presumably the Army, in accordance with the standard military tradition of accepting every challenge, no matter how impossible of execution, told him yes.

IT IS now clear that the Army was not prepared. True, it had hard luck in the form of the worst weather in many years; but there is substantial evidence that it also sent up pilots not properly trained, in planes not properly equipped. This doubtless resulted from lack of money, the fault of Congress and not of the Army; the military men would be delighted to spend $10,000 million annually if they could get it. It is no defense of the Army to say that military work is different from flying the mail; the theory that an enemy force would be polite enough to attack only in the daytime, in good weather and at the point where our planes happened to be, is too ridiculous for discussion. If we are to have a military air force at all, Army aviators should be trained and equipped to fly whenever and wherever anybody else is in the air. This fact gives added emphasis to the suggestion, already made in The New Republic, that the government should own and operate all aerial services, of every sort, in the United States. That is in our opinion the only way both to ensure proper training of all aviators and to avoid a wearisome series of scandals in connection with private mail contracts—a continuation of the series that has attended private operation of the mail throughout this country's history.

RAILROAD COORDINATOR Eastman draws the only possible conclusion when he reports to the President (a) that either all transportation should be subject to unitary federal regulation or none should be, and (b) that since we cannot abandon federal regulation of the railroads, power over water transportation, motor buses and trucks, aviation and pipe-lines, should also be conferred upon the Interstate Commerce Commission. Those who are continually complaining that the whole trouble comes from regulation and that free competition must be restored do not make realistic proposals when they are brought to the test of concrete action, and forget the very imperfect working of competition before restraints were imposed. Mr. Eastman is conscious, of course, that much of the pressure for extending federal regulation over waterways and motor transportation has come from railroads who hope that by this means their competitors may be hampered. However, he does not propose the measure as a protection for railway interests, but rather as the means of building up an orderly and efficient national system of transportation. Each branch of this system has its part to play; the task is to assign to each its proper share, while preventing discrimination, exploitation and confusion.

PRESIDENT Mendieta of Cuba moves from one crisis to another. The more of them he successfully surmounts, the clearer it becomes that the mass of the Cuban people are not satisfied with his regime. For this there are several reasons, but the chief of them is the conviction that he is the friend of the United States and of our capitalists, and that he was made President to pull their chestnuts out of the fire. Looking back over recent months, it is clear that President Roosevelt has not, in relation to Cuba, lived up to his promise not to meddle in the internal affairs of Latin America. We have recognized or withheld recognition for reasons of our own; we tried to buy off the disaffected masses with eight million dollars' worth of food; we have been working feverishly to prevent the creation of a Cuban government more radical than suits our purposes. There are two good reasons why we should abandon this attempt to dictate to Cuba. The first is that the policy is a self-defeating one. The second is that it is wrong, even by the standards set up by Mr. Roosevelt himself.

HITLER spoke rashly in urging the German automobile industry to motorize the nation by selling cars at such a low price that people in general could afford to buy them. What power does he have to bring about such a result? He can send Jews and labor leaders to concentration camps but, having destroyed the organizations of labor both in the factories and in the political field, he has left the industrialists masters of the situation. The motor manufacturers do not think they can make cars cheaply enough so that they can have a popular sale. And probably they are right. To make cars cheaply requires mass production carried to an extreme, and mass production requires a large market. The market simply is not there, because of the ruin of foreign trade and the scope that Nazism has offered to the self-destructive tendencies of capitalism. This is one of the few gestures Hitler has made toward a really progressive and helpful economic policy, and it is likely to remain an empty gesture, because he does not know how to get results except by means that do not succeed in the production and exchange of goods. Neither blackjack nor inflated oratory will reconstruct industry.

MISS Ruth Morgan, who died a few days ago in New York City, was a woman of wide public interests; but undoubtedly the thing for which she will be best remembered is her work in the field of international peace. She was one of the two or three persons most responsible for the tremendous wave of pacifist sentiment which in recent years has swept over millions of American women organized into

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

social, political and professional clubs. To be sure, the ultimate value of such pacifist feeling has yet to be weighed in the balance. There is no means of showing that it has materially altered the foreign policy of the United States or that it would successfully survive a wave of jingoistic emotion such as was artificially created in this country before the war with Spain. Like other leaders in the movement, Miss Morgan did not overestimate the importance of mere righteous indignation against militarism. She played an important part in the organized activity that sought to bring to the attention of the women's groups, and to the country as a whole, the causes of war and the reorganization of our society which is necessary to eliminate those causes. In this work she was brilliant, indefatigable and effective. It is one more evidence of the inscrutability of fate that she should be lost to this work at the moment when it is more urgently needed than ever before.

THE public, suffering from high prices of wines and liquors, and often getting inferior products, no doubt expects benefit from the President's action in lifting the quotas on the importation of these goods from abroad. The benefit will be strictly limited, however, by the fact that high duties and internal revenue taxes imposed both by the federal government and the states have not been reduced. These taxes are an invitation to the bootlegger to continue to pursue his business, and it is an open secret that he has responded nobly to the invitation. No doubt quantities of foreign goods are being smuggled in and, after liberal cutting, sold at a huge profit. In view of the fact that there is bound to be a shortage for several years of any type of wine or liquor that must be aged, there are only two genuine remedies open. One is to increase the supply as rapidly as possible by admitting foreign products, not only without quota restriction but with low duties. The other is to prevent profiteering on the basis of the shortage by means of public distribution, which enables the state governments to earn a revenue on the business without taxation, and helps to bring about fair prices for pure and honestly labeled products.

THE press announcement that President Roosevelt has selected Mr. Richard Washburn Child to serve as "unofficial ambassador" in Europe this summer does not give many details of the precise nature of Mr. Child's mission. Mr. Child's record as an "observer" at the Genoa Conference in 1922 makes one wonder, however, how Mr. Roosevelt happened to choose him for the job. The Genoa Conference, it will be remembered, was called to consider debts, credits and other post-war economic problems, and it was the first meeting of European powers to which representatives of Soviet Russia were invited. But behind the scenes, these important questions were speedily sidetracked and the Conference degenerated into an effort on the part of the international oil interests to obtain concessions in the rich oil fields of the Caucasus. When this developed, Mr. Child, then Ambassador at Rome, quickly appeared on the scene as an observer —on behalf of American oil interests. For it had been reported that the Russians, greatly in need of foreign credits, were on the point of signing a royalty contract with the British Royal-Dutch-Shell for the development of the Baku fields. This would have effectually ended the claim of the Standard Oil to portions of the Baku fields, which it had purchased from the Nobel interests after the properties had been nationalized. It was in this situation that Mr. Child announced that no agreement would be satisfactory unless it recognized the "open door." This meant, in plain words, recognition of the Standard Oil's property rights in Southern Russia. When the Soviet government was unwilling to make this concession, the Genoa Conference soon broke up. Russia did not obtain the credits it needed so badly, while Chicherin described the American proposal as a "return to the blockade of Russia." In view of the imminent danger of conflagration in Europe, sending Mr. Child does not seem to be the happiest gesture toward international amity.

IN THE debate on "rights," "duties," "principles" and half a thousand other abstractions supposed to bear on birth control, one little piece of concrete evidence comes to hand. The Mothers' Health Clinic of Miami, Florida, has taken the trouble to study the statistics of maternal mortality in Miami in the years before and since the clinic was opened. The clinic gives contraceptive information to women whose health indicates that they could not have a child with safety. The figures are not abstractions but a question of living women or dead women. From 1926 to 1928, before the clinic existed, the maternal mortality rate (deaths of mothers per 1,000 live births) stood at 8.4. During 1929 the clinic got to work spreading birth-control information to women for whom childbearing was physically dangerous. The result shows eloquently in the maternal mortality rate for 1933: 6.7. Had the old rate continued through 1933 it would have meant that sixty-five women who are now alive would have died in childbirth.

A DELICATE problem has lately been discussed in the correspondence column of The Daily Worker, chief Communist organ in the United States. Mr. Harold Edgar, dramatic critic for The Daily Worker, went to see the Theatre Guild production of John Wexley's play, "They Shall Not Die," based on the Scottsboro case. Mr. Edgar liked the play and said so in his review. Thereupon arose Mr. Arnold Dekker, to object. He, also, had evidently seen the play and liked it; but his mind was troubled by the fact that the Theatre Guild is a non-radical, indeed a definitely bourgeois, organization. He pointed out that none of its other recent productions had been of a character that could properly be recommended to a class-conscious member

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the proletariat. Ought not a good Communist to stay away from Mr. Wexley's good play, and thus keep from swelling the coffers of the Guild? While the question evidently troubled Mr. Edgar, he grappled bravely with it. He points out that money spent at the Guild box office also benefits "Wexley and the 'cause' of American social dramaturgy." On the whole, he feels that radicals should see the play, should cheer it and thereby "revitalize the dully correct audiences which generally attend Guild productions." His recommendation will doubtless be received with the customary "mixed emotions" both by the Theatre Guild and by some rigidly doctrinaire Communist party members; but it seems to us very good sense.

THE Nazis have begun long-distance radio broadcasting in the Ukrainian language. Perhaps this is merely revenge for Moscow's broadcasting anti-Nazi propaganda in German, but possibly it is being conducted with the hope of future developments. There were rumors that back of the recent improvement in Polish-German relations there were more tangible items than the pretty words in the public treaty. One of the items was reported to be a slice of the Ukraine for Poland in the event of a victorious war against the Soviet Union. Anyone who is inclined to dismiss talk of such goings-on as the fantasies of diseased imaginations has apparently forgotten the real-estate provisions of the secret treaties that long preceded the World War. That the Nazis' Ukrainian propaganda will have much effect on the Ukrainians is highly doubtful, but what of the motive for undertaking the propaganda?

Marching Toward Hell

THROUGHOUT the world, the nations are today moving toward war. This does not mean that conflict between any two given powers is overwhelmingly probable in the near future; but it does mean that all the forces which have formerly produced war are again at work and that the hopes which in the past fifteen years have been centered around the League of Nations and various other types of peace machinery are today at a lower ebb than ever before. To be sure, international tension fluctuates from month to month and almost from week to week. Crises are averted, and a "statesman" whose general attitude is occasionally belligerent makes a pacific speech, which causes a momentary brightening in the outlook. These fluctuations, however, are but minor curves on a graph whose general direction is steadily downward. All the misery of the past twenty years has failed to teach mankind how to avoid a repetition, or a continuance, of that misery.

Specifically, the efforts to achieve substantial reduction of armament have now become a failure that is positively grotesque in the light of the nations' purposes. Everyone knows that Germany is rearming with all her might and already has in her Storm Troops a well trained body of 2,500,000 men. Herr Hitler will not disband or reduce this force under any circumstances, though he professes his willingness to keep the nominal German army down to 300,000 for the present if he is given theoretical equality. France demands a firm system of international control of armament, and will pledge no reduction of her own forces while Germany's unofficial army continues to exist. She is about to float a loan of 3,000 million francs for military purposes. Great Britain, after a careful survey of the situation on the Continent, is planning a vast air force, second to none in the world. Italy is bending every effort to strengthen her military position and so are the other European powers, except those lucky states small enough to be exempt. The tension between Japan and Russia, face to face in Siberia, is known to everyone.

In the field of naval armament, the outlook seems equally black. Japan has openly declared her intention of demanding abolition of the present 5-5-3 ratio among Great Britain, the United States and herself, when the present treaties expire. She now wants equality, despite the fact that the disparity in general national strength between herself and these other powers continues as great as it was when these ratios were first fixed. The United States has also embarked upon a tremendous plan for naval building, for which nothing can be said except that it is still within the limits set by the treaties. Every student of naval affairs is well aware of the probability that the naval agreements will not be renewed and that before long, the world will again see unrestricted competition in the building of ships by all the chief powers.

Confronted with the approach of such a critical situation, one that dwarfs almost everything else into insignificance, the first impulse of every American is undoubtedly to ask: "Can't we stop it? And if so, how?" To these questions, various groups give different answers. The emotional pacifist replies: "Certainly we can stop it. We must work harder than ever to make the peoples of the world see the horror and folly of war." The radical answers: "The series of wars with which the world is confronted are the death struggles of predatory private capitalism. The only way to prevent them is to destroy private capitalism in all countries." The jingo replies: "We can't stop wars by other nations; but we can build an army and navy so huge that nobody will dare attack us and thereby make sure that the United States will at least remain aloof from the coming struggle."

The jingo, of course, overlooks the fact that men of his type are saying the same thing in every other country; and that all history shows that preparedness creates war, and not the contrary. Discussion of the pacifist and radical panaceas is also, unfortunately, almost useless in relation to the present world situation. The pacifists have been working hard for a generation and have almost

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

steadily lost ground during that whole period. They have certainly not made war any less likely, nor is there any evidence that their efforts will not all be swept away in the first week after hostilities have begun. The finest of the fine arts today is propaganda; every government knows how to mobilize mass public opinion, almost over night and on any given side of any given question. The radicals, too, have lately been fighting a losing battle. Not even the most fanatical among them believes that proletarian revolutions are possible quickly enough, in enough of the great countries, to have any effect upon the series of bloody conflicts that now threaten in Europe and Asia.

Across the Atlantic, it has long been the habit to put upon the United States the moral responsibility for the drift toward disaster. Looking back over the years, we find little substance in this indictment. There was never any genuine attempt in Europe to obtain the participation of this country in a peace of appeasement, one founded upon the principles of generosity and justice. Instead, we have seen a persistent series of efforts to enlist the United States in support of the national interest of one country or another under the pretext that this national interest was identical with the welfare of the world.

Has this situation now changed? Is there some course which the United States can pursue that will lessen the likelihood of war in the next five or ten years? There is one field, certainly, in which we could do a great deal. Among the world's war dangers must be listed the possibility of naval conflict between ourselves and Japan, and the present policy of our government is doing extraordinarily little to decrease that danger. Indeed, our naval building program is the strongest argument of the Japanese militarists in seeking to show the necessity for increasing their own strength. Our supposed imperialistic policy in the Far East, our exclusion of the Japanese under the present immigration law and discriminatory provisions in state statutes in the Far West have all been used effectively in Japan to show that America is unfriendly.

One of the best criticisms of our present policy toward Japan appears in a magazine article written by President Roosevelt eleven years ago in the columns of Asia, whose new editor, Richard J. Walsh, has performed a brilliant journalistic stroke by reprinting it in the current issue. Mr. Roosevelt, writing out of his experience as Assistant Secretary of the Navy during the Great War, says the overwhelming opinion of naval experts on both sides of the Pacific is that a war between these two countries would come to nothing in any military sense. We could not possibly defend the Philippines or successfully attack Japanese territory. The Japanese could not, except momentarily, invade the United States either directly or through Mexico. Recent naval invention, instead of making long-distance warfare more feasible, has made it less so. Such a war would develop into a stalemate and a struggle of economic attrition. In this struggle the United States would be overwhelmingly superior. We should like to call to the President's attention this passage from his article:

> Tableau: Japan and the United States, four or five thousand miles apart, making faces at one another across a no-man's-water as broad as the Pacific. Some genius might then arise to ask what it was all about and what the use was of the atrophy of national life and development. Or, to take a pessimistic view, jingo counsels might prevail in both nations until one or the other, or both, had bled to death through the pocketbook. If, then, it were realized by the people of this country and of Japan that a war would be a futile gesture, attended by no sufficiently compensating results, each nation might be in a fair way to change its apprehensive habit of mind.

Aside from setting our own house in order in our relation to Japan, the most useful contribution the United States can now make to the cause of world peace is to indicate clearly our determination not to become involved in any other war, anywhere. If Great Britain could be persuaded to join us in a declaration that these two great powers will maintain their neutrality at all costs, the effect would undoubtedly make for peace. If this is impossible, however, we should act alone. In the current issue of Foreign Affairs appears a striking article by Mr. Charles Warren, who, as Assistant Attorney General under President Wilson, was the official responsible for maintaining our rights as a neutral. Mr. Warren suggests that if we are not prepared to play an active part in efforts to preserve the peace—as we obviously are not—we should safeguard our neutrality by a series of statutes to prevent our being drawn into the next war as we were into the last one. He suggests that the sale of munitions to belligerents should be prevented; that American ships should not carry them, nor should Americans travel on foreign ships conveying war material, or on armed vessels, either as passengers or crew. Private loans to belligerents from this country should be prohibited. Communication in code between belligerent nationals in the United States and countries at war should be prevented. In short, Mr. Warren would prohibit all exercise of our supposed rights as a neutral which, as experience has proved, is overwhelmingly likely to get us into trouble.

The New Republic has often opposed embargoes and other economic "sanctions" as a means of preventing war or punishing a guilty belligerent, but non-intercourse with all warring nations as a desperate means of preserving neutrality is a different matter. Some of the details of Mr. Warren's suggestion may prove undesirable, but it is obvious that his proposal as a whole deserves immediate and careful attention. When the whole world is marching toward hell, the barest instinct of self-preservation should cause us to realize where we are going and consider taking a road which leads in some other direction.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Business Chases Its Tail

ALARMED by the continuance of unemployment and the large expenditure for relief which it necessitates, the President asked industry to come to his aid by reducing working hours 10 percent. If there were more than 14 million jobless at the bottom of the curve, if 2,750,000 have now been reëmployed, if the reduction in hours were honestly carried out by all employers, and if it resulted in an increase in the number of persons employed equivalent to the hours of work lopped off, about 2,500,000 more might be employed, leaving a total of more than 8 million out of work. These assumptions are the most favorable possible in estimating the results to be expected. They make it clear that in view of the President's aim, his request was an exceedingly modest one.

At the same time, of course, the President asked for a 10-percent increase in wage rates, to compensate for the shorter hours. This would not mean one additional cent in the pay envelope of anyone now employed. It would mean merely that total pay rolls and labor costs would be increased by the amount paid out to those whom it would be necessary to hire in order to carry out the program. It would mean, if the cost of living did not rise, an addition of 10 percent to the purchasing power now received by wage earners as a whole, though it would carry no increase in purchasing power to those who already have jobs. This also is a modest request in comparison with a program of genuine recovery, in view of the fact that pay rolls were nearly cut in half between 1929 and 1932.

According to recent reports from Washington, however, industry is not prepared to grant these requests, at least without a proviso. It wants to be assured that it may keep the price-fixing provisions whose effect is described in Mr. Mangold's article on page 150 of this issue. The excuse is that it needs to charge higher prices in order to make up for the increase in labor costs. If we are to judge by past performance, prices would be raised not only enough to compensate for the rise in labor cost, but more as well. Thus the purchasing power of labor would actually be less than before.

It is obvious that the President's program, even without the proviso attached to it by industry, is not a sufficient cure for unemployment. What we need in order to absorb the workless is much larger production. There is no other way out. While reduction of hours is in itself praiseworthy, it is by no means a sufficient remedy for depression. And we cannot get larger production without larger sales. We cannot get sufficiently larger sales by the heavy industries—in which the greatest volume of unemployment is concentrated—without a need for more materials, buildings and machinery on the part of industries serving individual consumers. That need will not arise unless their sales expand materially. And their sales, their production and their employment will not increase greatly unless they charge lower prices in relation to the incomes received by consumers, the bulk of whom consist of wage earners, small salary earners and farmers.

This is the basic fact which industry simply will not recognize. By charging consumers more every time its costs are increased through larger payments to those consumers, industry trots around a vicious circle. It prevents any increase in the purchasing power of consumers. It hampers anything like a lasting recovery. It chases the immediate gain of a larger profit margin on the unit sale, but overlooks the possible ultimate gain of larger volume of business, and larger profits by more sales at a smaller margin. This is criminal stupidity—though it is precisely what the record of business would lead us to expect. What improvement there is in the situation has come, not from the "self-government of business," but solely from the handing out of money by the government through crop control, bonus payments to farmers, the C.W.A. and, to a very limited extent, the P.W.A. But, as the government primes the pump, private business busily carries off all the water in its own pail.

The President and his N.R.A. have made a blunder in giving industry its head in the matter of prices. To try to bring recovery by controlling wages and hours and farm income, without also controlling in the interest of the consumer the prices of things to be bought by those wage and farm incomes, is to let industry chase its own tail. It is now sufficiently obvious that the President cannot delegate control of prices to business. Months ago we pointed out the impasse to which this would lead. Roosevelt confronts capitalism. We do not see how he can fail longer to recognize the inconsistency of trying to persuade private profit-seekers to act as if they were serving the public interest.

The Supreme Court Eats Crow

THE Supreme Court's decision affirming the constitutionality of the New York milk law has been widely, and correctly, hailed as a significant assurance of the validity of major features of the federal recovery program. But vitally important as these matters are, it is scarcely too much to say that they are trivial in comparison with other aspects of Mr. Justice Roberts' opinion. For not in this generation has the Supreme Court eaten so much crow. In a few sweeping paragraphs it solemnly abandoned positions that have been the source of the bitterest criticism heaped upon it since the turn of the century. It is a public misfortune that Mr. Justice McReynolds should have been chosen to write the dissenting opinion. An adequate explanation of what was happening would have been in the interest of popular education.

"The due-process clause," says Mr. Justice Roberts, "makes no mention . . . of prices. . . ." That is the nub of the whole matter. He continues:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The thought seems nevertheless to have persisted that there is something peculiarly sacrosanct about the price one may charge for what he sells, and that, however able to regulate other elements of manufacture or trade with incidental effect upon price, the state is incapable of directly controlling the price itself." Here is a supreme example of that judicial naïveté which is the height of the jurist's art. For Mr. Justice Roberts well knows, and the world knows with him, that the persons responsible for that persisting thought are not misguided lawyers, or ignorant laymen, but none other than his own brethren, past and present, on the Supreme Bench. A brief review of the history of the matter will be illuminating.

Not only does the due-process clause make no mention of prices, but when the original clause, which binds the federal government, was incorporated in the Fifth Amendment, price fixing was a familiar and accepted governmental practice. The natural supposition would have been that between due process and price fixing there was no lack of harmony. Nothing had happened to change this supposition when seventy-seven years later the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted, with its due-process clause binding the states. Indeed, as is well known, the view prevailed in the Supreme Court for many years thereafter that the clause had little, if anything, to do with the substantive validity of state legislation of whatever character restricting rights of contract and property. In 1876, while this view was in the ascendant, the Court decided its first price-fixing case, upholding in sweeping terms the power of the state of Illinois to control the rates charged by grain elevators in the city of Chicago. In an ill advised moment, however, Mr. Chief Justice Waite said that the business of the elevator men was "affected with a public interest." There is little reason to suppose that he meant anything more than that the business was subject to such regulation as the legislature had found it in the public interest to impose. Years later, however, judges of a different cast of thought seized upon the expression as a narrowly restrictive test of the states' power to fix prices.

Many have been the theories, variously sanctioned by the Supreme Court, as to when a business possesses this magic "affectation with a public interest"; when it is a "virtual monopoly"; when the privilege to engage in it has been "granted" by the public; when the property employed in it may be said to have been "dedicated to a public use"; in an exceptional case, when a historical analogue is recognized; and, most recently, when it is an industry "of paramount importance" to the state. The philosophy is that of Mr. Justice Brewer, candidly disclosed in a dissent to one of the early liberal holdings: "The paternalistic theory of government is to me odious." Their specific content is sufficiently indicated by what Chief Justice Taft wrote in 1923: "It has never been supposed since the adoption of the Constitution [*sic*] that the business of the butcher, or the baker, the tailor, the woodchopper, the mining operator or the miner was clothed with such a public interest that the price of his product or his wages could be fixed by state regulation. . . . An ordinary producer, manufacturer or shopkeeper may sell or not sell as he likes." To bring this list up to date there should be added the business of theatre-ticket brokers, employment agencies, gasoline vendors, by implication ice manufacturers and, perhaps most importantly, that of women in the District of Columbia who sell their labor.

This is the background that gives significance to Mr. Justice Roberts' statement that there is now nothing "peculiarly sacrosanct about the price one may charge for what he makes or sells." A host of nice differentiations were available to enable the Court to sustain this particular New York statute, without creating more. The three months' delay between argument of the case and announcement of the decision may well be referable to efforts of the minority to induce their brothers to take a narrower ground. The efforts, were there any such, were unsuccessful. Sweeping clean with a new broom, the Court brushed aside all the limiting excrescences that had grown up during half a century upon the salutary doctrine of the grain-elevator case. "The phrase 'affected with a public interest' can, in the nature of things, mean no more than that an industry, for adequate reason, is subject to control for the public good." This much established, there remains only the question of reasonableness, a question not different in kind for a price-fixing measure than for any other of the myriad forms of regulation to which business has been held validly subject. And now for the first time in many years the words of the Court, enunciating familiar but often disregarded canons, carry the conviction that comes from works: "If the laws passed are seen to have a reasonable relation to a proper legislative purpose, and are neither arbitrary nor discriminatory, the requirements of due process are satisfied. . . . 'Whether the free operation of the normal laws of competition is a wise and wholesome rule for trade and commerce is an economic question which this court need not consider or determine. . . .' [Quotation from the Northern Securities decision.] With the wisdom of the policy adopted, with the adequacy or practicability of the law enacted to forward it, the courts are *both incompetent and unauthorized* to deal."

It will be difficult for the Court to recapture the ground it has thus relinquished. It will be the more difficult because the coming years are unlikely soon to see again the conditions of prosperity and the climate of opinion in which the old ideas flourished. No one, of course, can yet say whether the institutions of the Constitution and judicial review will be able to survive the strain which the economics of recovery and reconstruction are sure to place upon them. But the decision in the milk case is the best omen of our time, and the nearest justification of faith.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

More Than Mob Terror

IT WAS more than mob terror. The recent outbreak of violence in Imperial Valley was too well organized; far too many police chiefs, deputy sheriffs and state highway policemen were involved; too many arrests were made where no charge was preferred; too many tear-gas bombs were thrown at striking Mexican women. This, at least, is what stands out in the report of a federal commission appointed by Senator Wagner to investigate the Imperial Valley strike and its suppression. The commission was composed of Professor J. L. Leonard of the University of Southern California, Simon J. Lubin, chief of the San Francisco Bureau of Commerce, and Will J. French, former member of the California Industrial Accident Commission. Its report deals not only with the events that occurred during the reign of terror but also with the unhealthy situation that made it possible.

The background of this agricultural strike of Mexican and Filipino lettuce pickers (demanding drinking water and wages somewhat above twenty-two and one-half cents an hour and, often, two hours' work a day) is the familiar story of so many other troubles today: the depression. The Valley as a year-round producer of truck crops is artificial; it is a desert converted to a hothouse by irrigation from the Colorado River, with the result that the capital charges per acre are extremely heavy. Already this has forced out the small individual farmer, so that today 90 percent of the land belongs to a small, compact group of men. Now, in turn, these are threatened with the loss of their land and they are bitterly determined to hold down the one expense they can control, their labor costs.

These expenses, in wide ranch country, include not only wages but living quarters, and in this desert, drinking water. The results of economy, however, are "filth, squalor, the entire absence of sanitation and crowding of human beings into totally inadequate tents or crude structures built of boards, weeds and anything that is found to hand. . . . The temperature rises above 100 degrees and the flies and insects become a pest." On many ranches pure water is not supplied, so the pickers necessarily drink the irrigation water, with the natural consequences of dysentery and typhoid. Back in 1928 these conditions led to the formation of a short-lived union which collapsed under internal dissensions. A new union composed solely of Mexicans sprang up in 1933 and dealt with the growers fairly successfully until January of this year, when it entered the Communist-controlled Cannery and Agricultural Workers' Industrial Union. The association proved either the reason or the excuse—the commission is noncommittal on this point—for the beginning of the reign of legal terror.

In the strike that followed, the entire Anglo-Saxon community of the Valley, citizens, newspapers and police, stood as a unit doing and approving utterly illegal actions. Strikers' meetings were raided with tear gas and drawn clubs. Men and women were arrested without being charged, two attorneys for the strikers were arrested as "vagrants," A. L. Wirin, attorney for the American Civil Liberties Union, was kidnaped and beaten, a federal injunction restraining the police from stopping strikers' meetings and pickets was openly flouted by the police while the newspapers of the Valley applauded them and denounced the legal red tape that offered protection "to forces working against peace."

The commission closes its report with several quotations from newspapers of the Valley, included not as horrible examples but as the clearest expression of what the commission found to be the actual sentiments of the non-Mexican residents:

> It is to be hoped that the law-enforcement officers will succeed in rounding up all those responsible for the vegetable workers' strike . . . the American Legion is to be commended for its readiness to "go to bat."
>
> Back of the officers stands a large group of citizens, the Vigilantes, ready to assist in cleaning the Valley of undesirables at a moment's call.
>
> It was not mob rule or mob violence that removed from Imperial Valley . . . the menace of active agitation among the lettuce growers. . . . It was a studied, organized movement of citizens. . . .

Under the none too euphemistic wording, "rounding up," "cleaning," "undesirables," the ugly facts emerge plainly enough. The Valley opinion was right. It was not mob rule or mob violence, it was *organized* mob rule. Let us go to a famous example of that sort of thing and call it Black Hundredism. But it is a question whether the tactics originated by the Tsar's police will succeed in Imperial Valley. The commission's report mentions "underground" organizing going on all the time. It mentions the "sullenness" of the Mexican field workers. Even the wholesale arrests of the citizens of the Valley may come back to plague them. The report finds that the overcrowded jails are a hotbed of organizing efforts, and it prophesies that another strike will take place during the next picking season. Labor unrest can't be cured by kidnapings and beatings.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1934, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT. DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY JOHN T. FLYNN
WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN LEWIS MUMFORD
GILBERT SELDES R. G. TUGWELL LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Six Months of the N.R.A.

I: The Blue Eagle Looks in the Mirror

THE MEETING of the N.R.A. Code Authorities in Washington began well. The inaugural session was held in Constitution Hall, one of those marble temples along Seventeenth Street, fronting the Oval, as frigid and official as a tax receipt. For an hour and a half before the session opened, lines of twenty-cent taxis crept up to its doors, bearing nearly five thousand magnates. Within the auditorium, diplomats of foreign nations looked down from boxes bearing the seals of their states. The Marine Band trumpeted military marches. There was even a ceremonial hush as Mr. Roosevelt entered.

Somewhere in the hours of group speech-making that followed, a morose economist from the N.R.A. research staff, Mr. A. K. Hettinger, announced from the platform, in effect, that the whole N.R.A. wages-and-hours program was pretty foolish. General Johnson became greatly aroused by this open insubordination. Painstakingly Mr. Hettinger explained that if the seventy-eight industries reporting to the Department of Labor were to absorb their unemployed, twenty-nine must adopt a thirty-hour week, nineteen or more a twenty-nine-hour week, eleven a twenty to twenty-four-hour week, and the rest still fewer hours, down to one industry that would have to go to a six-hour week. It was apparent that Mr. Hettinger did not think highly of the present or future of the N.R.A. Whereupon the listening magnates clapped loudly, although a glance at General Johnson should have warned them that this was really not their cue for applause.

Mr. Roosevelt's purpose in summoning the Code Authorities to Washington was to prepare the way for a downward revision of the hours-provisions in the codes. Surprisingly you found the great industrialists falling in docilely with the administration's plans. Although the report of the President's intention to reduce hours was everywhere being discussed by the little men, you heard no syllable of protest from the Henry I. Harrimans, the Myron C. Taylors, the Walter C. Teagles. The great industrialists are the ones who know that a long continued depression is usually followed by widespread and militant strikes. It is safe to say that every one of them, last week, had his eyes riveted on the automobile-strike situation in Michigan. Presumably they were contemplating how valuable, in time of a desperate strike, the Roosevelt name and the Roosevelt smile might be. The delicately managed delays of the Weirton case, for example, are something that cannot have failed to impress them. For the present, at any rate, they are willing to give lip service to an immensely popular political leader for the protection it will afford them. In other words, they appreciate the mechanics and philosophy of fascism and, rightly or wrongly, believe that President Roosevelt and the Blue Eagle can be used for fascist purposes.

Not so the medium-sized and small manufacturers, and this is the interesting thing about the Washington meeting. For two days after Mr. Roosevelt stopped speaking in Constitution Hall, they popped up one after another in group meetings, protesting passionately against the possibility of a decrease of hours under the codes. Speaker after speaker, to the bafflement of General Johnson, proclaimed that any reduction of the forty-hour week will bring on "a depression ten times worse" than the one we are now emerging from. Nothing could have been more obvious than that here were not the magnates of an N.R.A.-Rooseveltian-Corporate State. Small-town sovereigns they were, and being "coördinated" with the state was to them so much spinach. If state supervision of industry for the benefit of capitalism be admitted as a definition of fascism, there was not one of them who was fascist; and the reason was not far to seek. Not one of these petty tyrants appeared to have the slightest doubts about his ability to dominate and control his workers. Not one of them seemed to share the apprehensions of the great industrialists. The observer was forced to the conclusion that while the rank and file of factory owners continue this cocky self-assurance—which means, probably, until the labor movement becomes organized on truly national lines—the path of the N.R.A. is going to be thorny and the possibility of a fascist corporate state continue remote.

But the show, for all the bands and the magnates, had no unity, no direction, no spirit. Over it like a curse lay the withering dissection of the N.R.A. that had occurred a few days earlier during General Johnson's "field day" for critics. The speeches of Mr. Robert Minor, the Communist spokesman, of Mrs. Cornelia Pinchot, wife of the Governor of Pennsylvania, of Mrs. Elinore Moorehouse Herrick, vice-chairman of the New York Regional Labor Board and of a score of others, each in its own way, left little that seemed desirable, or even decent, of the N.R.A. General Johnson, by publishing a hastily drafted list of weaknesses of the N.R.A., had evidently intended to use the critics as reinforcements in his own efforts to persuade manufacturers, particularly the automobile manufacturers, to live up to the codes. Instead, he was apparently deeply disconcerted by the fierce indignation and ruthlessness of the criticisms presented.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What troubled General Johnson personally the most was the statement made by Mrs. Pinchot. General Johnson received a defeat at the hands of the steel companies on the Steel Code; he knows it, and he knows Mrs. Pinchot knows it. One passage in Mrs. Pinchot's statement is worth repeating:

> I wonder if General Johnson ever stays up nights and sees the faces of the people who are jobless and without resources, who went ahead and organized as allowed by the law and lost their jobs. I wonder what the workers think when they see Weir openly defying the United States government and getting away with it; when they see the case against him go to the Department of Justice and then back to the National Labor Board, and nothing issues but a silence so dramatic it has almost shaken their faith in the United States government.

That hurt. It stung General Johnson to an unjustifiable jibe at Governor Pinchot. For perhaps better than any other living person, General Johnson knows what Governor Pinchot has done for the civil liberties of steel workers and coal miners within his state.

As President Roosevelt declared in his speech in Constitution Hall, 90 percent of American industry is now formed through the N.R.A. in one great self-governing body. But neither the business men within this state-within-a-state, nor the farmers and workers outside it, seem overly happy about it. We seem to have traveled a long distance from the days last September when under the Blue Eagle men and women hopefully paraded for hours through the streets of nearly every town and city of the country.

Washington. JONATHAN MITCHELL.

II: Pocket-Picking Under the Codes

IF THE N.R.A.'s recent "field day of criticism" accomplished nothing more, it at least produced an avalanche of protest against the open-price provision, which has been written into nearly one-half of the three hundred or more approved codes. In many ways, the testimony offered against this provision was the most sensational of the entire hearings. For it revealed a startling trend toward monopolistic price-fixing under the codes and showed only too clearly what the beautiful phrase "self-government in industry" is likely to mean in actual practice.

The open-price agreement or association affords one of the best case studies now available of the N.R.A. as a going concern. And while certain restrictions may be placed on it in the near future, there is good reason for believing that these will not put an end to the abuses now practised, chiefly because the open-price provision is inextricably bound up with a number of other code requirements —especially the prohibition of sales below cost— and unless these provisions are also revised drastically, industry will still have comfortable scope for price boosting.

There is nothing objectionable, of course, in the ostensible purpose of the open-price association. It aims to provide an open record of prices of all manufacturers in a given industry. The price list of each manufacturer is filed with a central authority or trade association and thus is made available to his competitors. This publicity, it is said, prevents cutthroat underbidding and checks predatory price cutting. And it is with this purpose in mind that the N.R.A. approved numerous codes providing for open-price lists where the industries desired them. For cutthroat competition is indubitably a cause of sweatshop wages.

Unfortunately, this brief statement of theory does not cover all the possibilities. As the critics at the N.R.A. hearings pointed out during five full days of testimony, many industries have used the open-price list simply as a means for boosting prices to a uniform, high level. They have, in short, not only checked unfair competition, but have taken a long step toward eliminating all competition. There seems little doubt that, through the circulation of quotations within an industry, the tendency is for them to become uniform. This is most impressively illustrated by price data presented by Mr. E. J. Condon of Sears, Roebuck and Company on behalf of the Mail Order Association of America. Here are the "competitive" prices on cotton work-gloves from three separate manufacturers:

	Manufacturer		
Gloves (per dozen)	I	J	K
6 oz.	$ .95	$ .95	$ .95
8 oz.	1.00	1.00	1.00
10 oz.	1.20	1.20	1.20
12 oz.	1.35	1.35	1.35
14 oz.	1.50	1.50	1.50

From four manufacturers of wire screen cloth come the following quotations:

	Manufacturer			
12 Mesh Black Painted (per hundred feet)	O	P	Q	R
24″ wide	$3.88	$3.88	$3.88	$3.88
26″ "	4.21	4.21	4.21	4.21
28″ "	4.51	4.51	4.51	4.51
30″ "	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85
32″ "	5.18	5.18	5.18	5.18
36″ "	5.82	5.82	5.82	5.82
42″ "	7.12	7.12	7.12	7.12
48″ "	8.14	8.14	8.14	8.14

And from six manufacturers of rubberized fabrics we get this picture:

	Manufacturer				
Item (per yd.)	S	T	U	V	W
32 oz.—54″	$ .52	$ .52	$ .52	$ .52	$ .52
40 oz.—64″	.59	.59	.59	.59	.59
48 oz.—64″	.85	.85	.85	.85	.85

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These tables are offered here merely as suggestive material. They are simply specimens of the evidence available. The buyers for large retail stores and the purchasing agents of states and municipalities could present a bushel basket more of the same type. In the words of Miss Mary O'Connor, Director of Purchase of New York State, "the abuse of the so-called open-price association . . . is so well known that it might well be labeled disgraceful." Advertising for bids, she declared, is a farce, since "all prices are identical."

Miss O'Connor submitted to the N.R.A. a list of requirements now on file in the Purchase Department at Albany, amounting to $10 million. This potential purchasing power, she said, is frozen and at least one-half of it will remain frozen indefinitely, "so long as N.R.A. codes are being used as a cloak to disguise illegal, unethical and unfair combinations in restraint of trade." Many other states are in the same predicament, and since last August have been buying only absolutely essential requirements because of their inability to obtain fair bids. Some even are legally forbidden to buy where identical bids are received.

Mr. Condon was perfectly fair in presenting his evidence on the uniformity of quotations. "While we realize that a charge of collusion on prices would be most difficult to substantiate, we feel that the remarkable uniformity indicated is something more than mere coincidence." Likewise the Consumers' Advisory Board has observed that there is "sufficient coincidence in association of open-price systems with uniform prices to breed suspicion."

Uniformity of prices is, of course, only one phase of the work of an open-price association. The high level at which prices tend to be fixed is another characteristic. This is best shown by an analysis prepared by the Mail Order Association. The Association collected price data for various important lines of products over a period of nine years. These included electrical goods, enamel ware, hardware, metals, building paper, paint, pipes and fittings, roofing, furnaces, plaster, soil pipe, lumber and mill work. These items were then grouped in three divisions: (1) those items not covered by any code or under codes free from price provisions; (2) those items under approved codes containing open-price provisions; and (3) those under approved codes containing outright price-fixing provisions. Index numbers were then prepared for the average price of each group:

Index of Prices under No Code as Yet or Codes Free from Price Provisions

1924	1926	1929	Dec. 15, 1933
108.2	100.0	88.2	82.7

Index of Prices under Approved Codes Containing Open-Price Provisions

1924	1926	1929	Dec. 15, 1933
101.2	100.0	90.2	111.2

Index of Prices under Approved Codes Containing Outright Price-Fixing Provisions

1924	1926	1929	Dec. 15, 1933
100.8	100.0	95.3	98.6

United States Department of Labor
(Index of Prices of Farm Products)

1926	Dec. 16, 1933
100.0	55.9

From this it will be seen that, last December, with farm prices at little more than one-half of their 1926 level, prices quoted for products under open-price provisions were already 11.2 percent higher than in 1926 and 23.3 percent above those of prosperous 1929! "Another startling revelation," observed Mr. Condon, "is that open prices lead to greater heights than even outright price-fixing provisions."

How, it may be asked, are these high prices achieved and maintained? Many of them are obviously unreasonable and uneconomic. It is the opinion of the Consumers' Advisory Board that the open-price systems "identify the person or firm quoting the low price and thus facilitate the use of pressure to force his price up to the level generally desired in the industry." A recent letter, sent by the Code Authority in one of our largest industries to a member of the industry, offers eloquent proof of how this pressure is applied. We quote at considerable length:

> . . . in reference to this same grade [of product] it was pointed out that your filed prices were, roughly, 10 percent less than those filed by your competitors. In view of their experience in the manufacture of a similar grade they feel it doubtful that you could justify such prices. Consequently, I feel sure that you will wish to revise your prices so that they will bear a closer relation to those of your competitors. They pointed out that in the event you found yourselves unable to coöperate that it was the opinion of some members that they might have to resort to the procedure provided for in Section — of the Code. Under this provision a member may complain to the Industry Authority in regard to your price schedule. This will lead to an investigation to ascertain as to whether your prices can be justified on the basis of the rules for determining costs. Such procedure is, of course, unpleasant and costly. I am sure this matter can be straightened out without resorting to any such action.
>
> It was pointed out that in the event the investigation proved that your price schedule could be justified on the basis of your own cost that the members would then be forced to meet your prices. This would then destroy your existing competitive advantage, and merely serve to lower the existing price structure to no avail.

Thus is self-government in industry served, and "cutthroat" competition eliminated!

It is, of course, absurd to leave the manipulation of prices in the hands of those who have vested

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interests at stake. It is nothing new that when industries have the power, they will boost prices as high as possible. They will do it no matter how many times General Johnson cries, as he did in New York City, "For God's sake, keep prices down." It may be pointed out that, in reality, the codes confer no such powers of monopoly. Indeed, the N.R.A.'s chief counsel, Donald Richberg, has frequently issued warnings to this effect. But here we are discussing not what the codes or the Recovery Act prescribes, but what the industries are actually doing.

The open-price association is, moreover, only one of the instruments of monopoly that industry has fashioned out of the N.R.A. The provision against selling below cost, in a large majority of codes, can be used to serve similar ends. For in many instances "cost" is determined by special accounting methods set up by the industry itself. How this may work out is suggested by the "Standard Cost Formula" of the Luggage and Fancy Leather Goods Industry. Following the approval of this formula by the N.R.A., industry members received the following instructions:

> The percentage [to cover costs other than direct labor and materials] must be computed by each individual concern. . . . However, no percentage shall be used less than 33 1-3 percent even though the actual budget figures would suggest a lower figure. . . . Any concern actually able to produce their product at a cost of less than 33 1-3 percent above the total cost of material and direct labor will be compensated through additional margin of profit between cost and selling price.

And in the Uniform Accounting Manual of the Rubber Manufacturing Industry one finds that the industry suggests *two* methods of determining costs —one for *internal* accounting purposes, the other for determining prices. In other words, while the manufacturer is kidding the public about his fictitiously high costs, he should be careful to keep real costs straight.

These illustrations could be multiplied. The essential point is the unequivocal evidence they offer of how industry is assuming the responsibilities of self-government, and of the kind of self-government it is giving itself. Some of the most objectionable—and most public—pocket picking will no doubt be policed more carefully as a result of the criticism offered in Washington. But clearly more is needed than superficial, structural modification of the codes. The N.R.A. has given industries extraordinary opportunities for "coöperation." What is needed now is some form of governmental control over the manner in which industries use their new powers. The N.R.A. has no such control today unless it decides to invoke the anti-trust laws in drastic fashion. There is no hope that the Code Authorities will, of themselves, forget their selfishness long enough to realize that their price boosting endangers the entire recovery program.

WILLIAM P. MANGOLD.

Washington.

In the Land of Cotton

THINGS are a little better in the South—though they are still so bad that one despairs of being able to tell how bad they are. There is a little more money in circulation, and some of it is passing through the hands of people so poor that the spending is instantaneous. Mail-order houses have noted a startling increase in their sales throughout this area. Local retailers in many communities tell the same story. Those parts of the South that benefit from the winter tourist trade report a tremendous improvement in business this winter. In general, there is more confidence than there was a few months ago. People are not hoarding their money quite so hysterically—those who have any to hoard. The impression is fairly widespread that the worst is over.

At the same time, the South has still plenty to worry about. By and large, it has been supported these past few months on federal money, distributed chiefly through the C.W.A. and the A.A.A. The distribution has been excessively inequitable, especially among the Negroes. Millions of them, and of the poor whites, are below any sort of decent subsistence level. This is particularly true of the share-croppers and tenant farmers in general. Indeed, unless Washington takes new and careful steps to protect them, hundreds of thousands of share-croppers will be turned adrift this year by the landlords to starve (as has already happened to large numbers).

For the South as a whole, the N.R.A. has been much less help than one would suppose if he read only the reports from Washington. While the codes have raised wages in certain industries, these increases have been eaten up by the higher cost of living. Moreover, the codes are widely violated, in the South as everywhere else. Also, even under the codes, wages are fixed in certain industries as low as $7 a week.

The greatest single factor in bringing the South through the winter has been the C.W.A., which poured out its millions with a minimum of red tape, putting the money where it was most badly needed. I hate to think what would have happened without it. The A.A.A. also helped, by distributing more than $100 million in its cotton-reduction program,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which at the same time doubled the price. Throughout the South, however, much of this money failed to reach the hands of those for whom it was intended. Landlords and other creditors of the poor farmers have taken the money away from them on various pretexts. In other cases, landowners have deliberately turned out their tenants, knowing that the C.W.A. or the Red Cross would be obliged to take care of them. No one will ever know how much suffering has gone on, these past few months, in the South. Southerners are proud and silent. They don't grin and bear it; they just bear it.

The Blue Eagle and the Black Man.—What has happened to the Negro industrial worker under the N.R.A.? The general testimony in the South is that his position has been worsened in relation to the white worker, though just how much is a matter of dispute. In some of the codes, there is definite discrimination against certain occupations, which are followed mainly by Negroes. In nearly all codes, wage rates are lower in the South than in the North (on the theory of lower living costs) and this operates against Negroes, since the great majority of them are in that region. In certain cases there is also discrimination against laborers in the lowest wage groups, most of whom are Negroes.

The theory has been advanced, and widely publicized, that the codes have resulted in wholesale dismissal of Negroes whose places were taken by white men. The argument runs that an employer who is compelled to pay $12 a week reasons that for this sum he might as well have the superior industry and skill of a white man. When I sought, however, for specific evidence that this was true on a wide scale, it was hard to get the facts. In the first place, as I have said, there are several important codes whose minimum wages are far less than $12—sometimes only $7 or so, which is not, even in the South, a minimum that makes Negro labor impracticable. For another thing, the supposed superiority over the Negro of the kind of white labor available at $12 is pretty much a myth: there are factory owners who will tell you that their Negro workers are about as good as the whites and on some operations better. Even before the codes, certain employers, for no ascertainable reason, had the habit of shifting back and forth between Negroes and whites: a hotel, for instance, would decide one year to have Negro waiters and elevator boys, and next year would replace them with white workers; or a factory might do the same. In a good many cases white men have driven out Negroes because individuals of superior equipment are today available at starvation wages. As a wise Southerner expressed it to me: "Nowadays it's not hard to get a young white man who is a college graduate to drive a truck at truck-drivers' wages. Such a man obviously has a better future in the business than the average Negro. It is only natural that the boss should prefer to employ him." On the other hand, there are a good many authenticated cases of Negroes' being dismissed since the codes came into effect, on this argument of their not being worth the new legal minimum wages.

There is one important employer who is conducting a widespread propaganda in favor of lower wages for Negroes under all circumstances, on the ground that the Negro race is biologically inferior to the white (a point of view with which hardly a competent anthropologist in the world would agree). It is interesting to note that this man is a Northerner who moved South only a short time ago.

Judge Lynch at Home.—Southerners often make the point, and no doubt with justice, that no Northerner can really understand the Negro problem. The following remarks do not represent my own opinion, but the combined view of several well known Southern men who have devoted special study to this question—men whose names, if I could give them, would be accepted even by those who are most hostile to adverse criticism from the North:

Everyone knows, by now, that lynching is primarily an economic problem. The old theory that Southern Negroes are lynched because they have raped, or attempted to rape, white women, gives way completely under an analysis of the facts. Only a small percentage of the cases are of this character. The remainder come because of the economic strain of competition or exploitation of one sort or another.

Broadly speaking, there are two great Southern lynching areas, and two types of this crime. In the Piedmont region, the uplands, Negroes are lynched by white men who are roughly on the same economic level. They are lynched in disputes over monetary matters, because of race conflicts over an undersupply of jobs, and the like. In the "Black Belt," lynchings are of a quite different character. In that region, the wealthy white aristocrats, landowners or men who get their livings indirectly out of landowning, lynch as part of the general effort to keep the working Negroes in subjection and properly respectful. In most cases, of course, the participants in these lynchings do not act in the light of any such conscious intention; but the community purpose is there.

The theory that lynchings take place because the mob believes the processes of the law are slow and are likely to let the guilty escape, also breaks down under analysis. In most of the communities with a high likelihood of lynching, the law is reasonably prompt, and there is a strong degree of probability that any Negro defendant will be found guilty. There is, indeed, a much better chance that the innocent will be punished than that the guilty will escape.

That lynching is fundamentally an economic phenomenon is easy to prove. If you make a chart showing fluctuations in the price of cotton and in the number of lynchings, these two lines will be seen

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to go in opposite directions. When the price of cotton goes down, the number of lynchings rises. People who have devoted many years to studying the subject were not surprised at the dreadful increase in this crime in the year 1933. They were surprised that it wasn't worse.

Liberal vs. Radical.—Southerners who qualify as experts on this problem are in favor of the Wagner-Costigan federal Anti-Lynching Bill. They do not expect that it will have much actual influence, but they regard it as a useful device to bring this problem sharply to the attention of the South, and thereby accelerate the campaign of public education which, in their opinion, had acted effectively over many years, prior to 1933, to reduce the annual toll of Judge Lynch. An important part in this work, and one which has never had adequate attention, is the effort of the Interracial Committees in trying to create a better understanding between the races, and to build up public opinion in favor of law and order.

These activities are of many sorts. When a sheriff stands out courageously against a lynching mob, he gets a handsome medal, presented to him in a public ceremony with speeches or messages of congratulation from the leading officials of his state. When a new sheriff takes office, a committee, usually of women and including some of the leading white women of his town, waits upon him and gets him to sign an unequivocal public statement that he will not tolerate lynching in his county. Much has been done to bring together white and Negro women in their church activities, which are so tremendously important in the small towns of the South. Throughout the white schools and colleges of the region, students are encouraged to study the Negro problem, to write about it and to make posters, for public display, portraying the upward struggle of the colored race.

Between the liberals, who work along these lines, and the radicals of the Communist party, there is, of course, an unbridgeable gulf. The Communists insist that everyone outside their own ranks is a fascist, engaged, directly or indirectly, in doing the work of the capitalist masters. The liberals are not so violent in language, but they are equally drastic in their criticism. They say that the whole Communist effort in this region has had amazingly small results, and they are inclined to attribute this, rightly or wrongly, to the fact that policies have been made in New York or Moscow, without adequate understanding of the actual position in the South. They say that Communism is making little headway among the Southern white industrial workers, who ought to be good "prospects" since they are mercilessly exploited and live in the most desolate poverty. The reason is, in the judgment of the liberals, that the Communists start with the Negroes, overlooking the race prejudice which is shared by so many even among the poorest whites. It is quite widely believed in the South that the Communists have promised the Negroes separate all-black states of their own: a promise that would be effective among the suppressed racial minorities of Europe, but one that does not find a very ready response among most of the Negroes, who are opposed to "segregation."

The old debate still rages fiercely as to whether the Communists do more harm than good by injecting themselves into such cases as those of the Scottsboro boys. On one side it is said that since the South is so bitterly hostile to radicalism, to have the defense aided or directed by radicals is practically an automatic guarantee that the jury will reflect the overwhelming anti-radical sentiment of the community and will lose sight of the minor question of the guilt or innocence of the accused. On the other hand, it is admitted that the radicals are extraordinarily alert and active, that they are masters of propaganda, and that they bring to public attention some cases that might never otherwise see the light of day. The suggestion is made that even though they do not materially aid the victims in any specific instance, the worldwide hullabaloo which they create probably prevents additional cases of the same sort in the future. This argument is one in which the only clear fact is that neither side will ever convince the other, and that anyone who, like myself, attempts even to summarize the dispute, is sure to be denounced by one side or both.

Those who are working for amelioration of conditions believe that far more effective than any other measure would be the creation of a strong state constabulary in each Southern commonwealth, on the general model of the State Police in New York, Pennsylvania and elsewhere. They point out that there are great areas in the South in which there is hardly any provision for law enforcement at all. Even when the local sheriff means well, his territory is too big, and he has little assistance except that of temporary deputies who do not understand the technique of police work and are likely in an emergency to sympathize more with the mob than its victim. There would be a parallel situation if New York City dismissed all its policemen, and substituted in each neighborhood some well meaning and well known citizen who would ask a few of his friends to help him out in case of trouble. A state constabulary would consist of experts trained in police methods, not subject to local influence and adequately equipped with automobiles, radio and so on. Some Southern states also need what is now prevented by law: automatic change of venue so that in case community feeling ran high, the prospective victim could in all instances be moved far enough away to eliminate this danger.

Blame It on the Niggers.—In the recent past, a number of cases have come to light in which white men have committed crimes while masquerading as Negroes. In Savannah, Georgia, an automobile bandit was killed during a hold-up and found to be a white man whose face was blackened with burnt

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cork. In Norfolk, Virginia, a woman struggling with a robber, apparently a Negro, tore open his shirt and found that he was white. In Louisville, Kentucky, a girl beat off an assailant who she thought was a Negro, only to find her face and hands covered with smut. In Detroit, Michigan, a hold-up man was captured leaving the scene of his crime and discovered to be wearing burnt cork. Another man caught the same way in St. Louis, Missouri, confessed that there was an organized group of white bandits who always operated in this manner in order to divert suspicion from themselves. How many other similar cases there have been, where the criminal escaped detection, nobody knows. It is not at all impossible that Negroes have been lynched, not only when they were innocent (everyone knows that this happens) but when no other Negro was guilty.

It is certain also that in many cases, white people have, for purposes of their own, accused Negroes of crimes they had not committed. A Negro in Mississippi was sentenced to life imprisonment on the unsupported testimony of a white man who afterward confessed that he had invented the whole story to satisfy a grudge against the Negro in question. In the same state a detective "framed" an innocent Negro in order to collect a reward of $3,000 for a train robbery. Fort Worth, Texas, was the scene of a similar case, in which white men murdered two innocent Negroes and tried to collect $10,000 reward offered for the capture of two bank robbers "dead or alive." At Sebring, Florida, a Negro was accused of the murder of a woman and her baby, by the woman's husband; it was afterward proved that the husband himself had committed the murder. There are a number of authenticated cases where women have made against Negroes wholly baseless accusations of assault, the reasons for which lie deep in the shadows of pathology. It is one of the terrible fruits of such an interracial situation as we find in the South that almost any member of one race can cause dire consequences to the other by an accusation that may be utterly without justification.

Black Schools.—Even the white schools of the South have been all but wrecked by the depression. Everyone knows that thousands of them have closed down for lack of funds, or shortened the school term by months. Always, before the depression, Negro education was a very sketchy business. Negro schools were few, understaffed and ill equipped. Some Northern philanthropists, and notably Mr. Julius Rosenwald, have given large sums to aid the Negro, but even in the aggregate, these were insignificant compared with the need. In the depression, too little has been whittled down into almost nothing at all. Nevertheless, Negro schooling does go on. Somehow or other, even the Negro colleges, precariously balanced at the top of a very slender pyramid, have managed to survive. Their work as a whole, of course, cannot yet be compared with the work of the white colleges, though there are individual Negro college professors, especially in the pure sciences, who command worldwide respect. Negro higher education is still, perhaps, mainly useful as a flag, a symbol to the race of what may be in the future. As such, it has a usefulness so great that probably nobody but a Negro can appraise it properly.

Marse Roosevelt.—Throughout the South I found that President Roosevelt's amazing personal popularity continues virtually unabated. Many of the acts of his administration are violently disliked; but by some miracle of the public psychology, blame descends upon "those fellows at Washington" and does not touch the President despite the fact that he is the chief among "those fellows." Most of the reasons for his hold on the affection of the common man are the same as in other parts of the country: the feeling that he is concerned for poor people, his geniality, the excellent appearance he makes in the talking newsreels and, above all, his fine radio voice and the simplicity and friendliness with which he has on so many occasions talked over national affairs with the whole population in a neighborly way.

There is, however, one special reason, which seems to me peculiarly Southern and illuminating. The President is liked, in that area, largely because he has spent so much time in the South. After his attack of infantile paralysis, he lived much of the time for several years at Warm Springs, Georgia, where, as everyone knows, he still maintains a home and is one of the most active supporters of the Warm Springs Foundation. The South feels therefore that he knows at first hand about its problems; that he is not just one more cold No'thener from the cold No'th. A little personal contact goes a long way, below the Mason and Dixon line.

Atlanta, Georgia. BRUCE BLIVEN.

Off to a Concentration Camp

THE OBVIOUS reason for sending a man to a concentration camp in Germany today is his political beliefs. The Nazis say that if a man refuses to change his beliefs and continues propounding opinions that are detrimental to the Nazi cause he should be sent to the camp in order to change his ideas. For instance, the problem worked out very simply in a small town near Berlin. Almost half of the town was communistic when Hitler came into power. The leader of the local Storm Troopers stated the town's position clearly, when asked what happened to the Communists.

"They all turned National Socialist the day after Hitler was elected."

"All of them?"

"All but two. They were sent to Oranienburg for three months and came back National Socialists."

Stories of this kind have given rise to the popular German conundrum that is whispered behind hands:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Why is a Storm Trooper like a beefsteak? Because he's brown on the outside and red on the inside."

Social Democrats are most frequently sent to the camps for "accepting graft" or talking against the Nazi party. Jews are sent for "spreading atrocity lies" and for "usury." "Usury" can cover many things. In most cases it applies to small storekeepers who charge a few pfennigs more than their competitors for certain articles. But it can as easily be interpreted to mean the unfair competition of charging a few pfennigs less. It has proved a convenient method for closing many Jewish shops. Communists are accused of spreading their pamphlets surreptitiously. Jews and Communists are the most frequent victims of the camps, but no one except the high Nazi official is safe in Germany today. Arrests can be made at any time, in any place, without warrant, by a force of political police or by any of the vast army of Storm Troopers. No cause need be given the victim for his incarceration. There is no redress, no trial by jury or judge, no definite sentence. The threat of the concentration camp, and its attendant horrors, has developed a fear complex throughout Germany that is obvious in the faces of the people. It has created nervous tension in restaurants, on the streets, in subways, even in a man's own home. I heard a cultured woman say she felt sure she'd end in a camp because of her sharp tongue and her preference for jokes about the Nazis. She had a private collection of 500 jokes. She said, "When they ask me at the camp whether I want to learn cooking or sewing, I'll choose sewing. I've always wanted to learn how.

The power of an individual to vent his personal spite is endless today in Germany. A man can say, "I heard Schmidt saying he didn't think Hitler would last a month." Schmidt isn't given a chance to prove that he didn't make the remark. He is taken off on the uncorroborated word of his enemy. The enemy may simply have coveted Schmidt's job.

A conspicuous instance of personal fear was shown by a well known Berliner named Adler, who had a message printed on his calling cards to the effect that anyone accusing him of being Jewish would be sued for libel. Adler would have won the suit. Several Aryans of proved ancestry and doubtful names have collected money from people who called them Jews.

Germany has recently been faced with a difficult problem of propaganda in connection with her camps. Obviously it is to Germany's advantage for the world to know that her political prisoners are being freed—hence the newsreel shorts we have been shown recently of political prisoners in long queues, being released from Sonnenberg prison, the winter quarters of Oranienburg. There is no accompanying caption stating what is known to be true, that most of the prisoners released are Nazis incarcerated for short times, for minor offenses.

Inside Germany it is bad propaganda to tell the Germans that large numbers from the camps have been turned loose. Hence there was no publicity. The men were told to scatter and lie low for a while before returning to their homes in order not to terrify the people who have been led to believe that the camps are filled with Jewish and Communist terrorists.

Some of the more bizarre reasons for sending men to camps are shown in these actual cases.

Gustave was a German citizen living in Holland. His Dutch wife, Ilsa, was prone to believe the horrid things she read about the Nazis. Gustave was hurt by this and so he took his wife for a visit to Germany, convinced that she would believe in the goodness of Hitler and the Third Reich if she could be near them.

They went to his native town on the Rhine and he took her to a street famous for its night life. They drank wine and the Dutch wife was pretty well convinced that she and the other foreigners had entertained false opinions of the New Germany. She was about to say so outside the last *Weinstube* when she felt her pocketbook snatched from her arm. The sneak thief disappeared into the night. Ilsa screamed and the police came. Gustave was furious. In a decent town on a lighted street, to have this thing happen to self-respecting people! He lost his temper. "This wouldn't have happened in the old days!" he told the policeman. Ilsa went back alone to Holland the next day. Gustave went to the nearest concentration camp.

Franz was a brilliant young heart specialist who had achieved a position of authority while still very young. He lived in a university town and was connected with a hospital there. During his impetuous youth he had been an ardent Nazi, even fighting with Hitler in one of his forays. Later he was too much wrapped up in his work to follow his political enthusiasms. About a year before Hitler came into power a young lady friend of the doctor's fell ill. He knew that she, like himself, was a great admirer of the Nazi chieftain. So he took to her hospital room the largest pictures he could find of Hitler, to cheer her illness. She was pleased and they forgot the incident. Shortly after Hitler came to power Franz found himself under political arrest. He explained that he admired and loved Hitler, he had even fought with him. That did him no good. The incident of the pictures was cited as a mark of disrespect to the Leader. He went to camp for several months, and the painful sight of a young doctor who had attained a position of authority was removed from the eyes of his older colleagues.

August Borsch drove a beer truck in a suburb of Berlin until old age and rheumatism overcame him. Then he managed to subsist on his compensation insurance. He was happy to have Hitler elected and to feel that Germany was at last going to take hold of herself and come back to life. His enthusiasm made him feel actually young and healthy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

again, in spite of his extreme poverty. Then his youngest son, William, came home. William was a Communist, and Hitler or no Hitler, he meant to remain one. He went around spouting on all occasions, but no one took him seriously. They never had in his home town. They merely laughed at him. But August didn't laugh; he was furious with his son. He wrote to Oranienburg and asked if they would please come and take Willi off his hands. Willi was arrested and held in the camp several months. When he came home, he still had crazy notions. He said he'd like to go back, at least he had work to do there in camp. They had taught him to be a butcher and now here he was home again, without a job. What good did it do him to have a trade? August Borsch resigned himself to the fact that nothing could be done with the boy. The police wouldn't arrest him a second time.

Heinrich sent his four-year-old son out to buy a newspaper. The boy had only to cross the street, and he was in the habit of asking the corner policeman to help him. This time little Hans asked the policeman and reached for the big man's hand. As they crossed the street, Hans stared at him.

"Are you a Nazi?" he asked.

"Yes."

"My grandmother says the Nazis are the wickedest people in the world."

Grandma didn't go to camp. Neither did Hans. They decided that it was father who needed the lesson in civic respect.

Kranz was a Jew, and the mildest of men. He hadn't engaged in any business for years, he had no earthly possession or job that anyone could covet. He had never dabbled in politics, and he had kept to himself rigorously since the advent of National Socialism, never offending a restaurant, coffee house, or theatre with his presence. He was really perplexed when he was taken to the concentration camp. But then he remembered. Years ago he had pressed a lawsuit for damages against Herman Lenk, the Storm Troop Leader of his town. Lenk had maliciously broken the plate-glass window of the shoe store Kranz owned at that time. Unfortunately, Kranz had won the damage suit.

VERNE ANDREWS.

Your Hand and Mine

I always fold my gloves, place them palm to palm,
As if in them dwelt the ghosts of your hand and my hand,
Needing to be comforted, ensured safety and calm,
Always together and close at last, you understand.

If someone does the same for us at the end,
When we are used and done with for the time being,
I shall want to know his name, who would comfort and befriend
Thus the two of us, still so well paired and agreeing.

VALENTINE ACKLAND.

Washington Notes

Surprise of the Innocents—Good-thing Patriots—Consumers vs. the General—Getting a Year's Snooze at the Switch

AS THIS is written, the progress made by General Johnson in inducing industry to accept revision of its codes in the interests of employing more men at shorter hours can be measured with an inch rule. Contrary to the response expected from the elaborately staged meeting at which the President presented his "challenge," the industrialists and manufacturers with almost complete solidarity reacted in the other direction. In the meetings following Mr. Roosevelt's appeal they subjected the N.R.A. to a greater critical fire than it has yet suffered, and found an infinite variety of reasons why the program could not be carried out. I see no cause for surprise at this. On the contrary, it seems to me it should have been expected.

During the early days of code formation, the industrialists, making certain concessions, obtained certain advantages which entirely satisfied them. With great unanimity, the bigger ones coöperated with the General, praised the N.R.A. and accepted the codes. Under them, they have been able to eliminate cutthroat competition, increase the prices of their products and operate at a profit, which has brought a good many of them out of the red. But they were able to do this at a minimum cost in sacrifices to organized labor or in the way of spreading the work. So most of them have been very happy over the N.R.A. and have been "wholeheartedly" back of General Johnson. In short they regarded themselves as a band of sterling patriots, supporting their government in a time of crisis, regardless of their own selfish interests. This, of course, is complete rubbish. They made no real sacrifices. They gained vastly more under the codes than the pittance they gave away.

But the result has been the increasing resentment and discontent among the squeezed little business man, the gouged consumer and the misled labor organizations, who thought they were going to get an even break. And it was only when the dissatisfaction had accumulated to a point that threatened the whole N.R.A. structure that General Johnson called his meeting to hear criticisms and followed it up with an assembly of the industrial code authorities to hear Mr. Roosevelt elucidate the situation and make his appeal.

Now, we are told, the codes are to be revised to correct the mistakes and injustices. But it is scarcely surprising to find business men against any revision. Nine months ago, if the General had insisted upon the things he now proposes, it would have been a different story. At that time business men were in such a desperate state of mind that they were eager to agree to anything to gain governmental support and guidance—ready, a lot of them, to be completely taken over if necessary. Since then there has been improvement in business. The larger employers of labor have been operating happily under the code, freed from the irritations and restraint of the anti-trust laws, permitted to make delicate agreements among themselves and fix prices.

Few people, I think, want to see big or little business

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unable to thrive and make a profit, but the way things have developed, the larger units of industry have regained prosperity without spreading it either among their employees or the public. Despite General Johnson's assertion, the really reliable figures show that a relatively small number of men have been reëmployed by industry; that wages have not gone up or hours gone down so much as was hoped. To be frank about it, the N.R.A. has failed—measurably failed, many believe—to reach its objectives, and if it were not for the federal relief agencies, the millions of unemployed would be in a critical condition. Apparently realizing this at last, the President and General Johnson are now prepared to make a great effort to compel industry to employ a far larger number of men. I say compel, because nothing but compulsion, in my judgment, will make the effort successful. At the moment, the determined character of the resistance among the employers is too clear to mistake. It remains to be seen whether there is strength enough in the N.R.A. management, backed by Mr. Roosevelt, to gain their goal of the immediate reëmployment of a million men. To those who appreciate the real situation, it seems extremely vital that their goal, and far more, be reached, and reached soon.

The problem of providing funds for relief is growing constantly more difficult both for the federal government and the states. In his speech to the industrial leaders last week, the President frankly declared that it was impossible to expect the federal government to carry this burden indefinitely, that the stage had been reached where industry in its own interest must bear its share. It was a stirring appeal, backed by facts more potent than those he revealed in the speech, but if he expects industry to accept this "challenge" voluntarily, he is doomed to disappointment. It will respond only under great pressure from General Johnson, or if it is again terrified into a state of acquiescence. Perhaps it will work out one way or the other, but it is discouraging to see the state into which the General has let his own organization fall. No one pretends that internal harmony exists any longer. His subordinates differ with him privately, and some publicly, and his temper has not been sweetened by the experiences of the week.

There was a real tilt between the General and his Consumers' Advisory Board, which would, I am credibly informed, have resulted in the resignation of several members had the General not finally permitted the publication of the Board's report. The report was a pretty direct, documented criticism showing the unjustifiable rise in prices produced by the codes. Then too, of course, compliance with the codes even as they exist has become so lax as to be almost ridiculous. There is plenty of proof of this and the General concedes enforcement to be one of his major problems. Altogether, the state of affairs in the N.R.A. at the close of its much heralded "round-up" is not pleasant to contemplate. It is possible, of course, to end the confusion, to revise the codes, to compel industry to make the necessary concessions, to put its house in order. But it is a huge job and will require tremendous energy, concentration and skill. It seems almost tragic that this great scheme for social betterment and national recovery should have lost so much prestige and power in so short a time. The further fact is that the President's request, scheduled to be made of Congress this week, for an extension of the licensing power of N.R.A., which automatically expires in June, will have to be forced through by administration weight instead of being shot through by Congress with a shout of enthusiasm. No better evidence of what has happened to the Blue Eagle could be given.

I myself doubt very much whether, by the time this is printed, the tariff power asked by the President will have been granted to Congress. Notwithstanding the certainty of a strong opposition, led journalistically by the Hearst press, the general opinion still is that the President will have his way and the authority be given. But of one thing there is no question. Mr. Roosevelt wants the authority for tariff adjustment more than he wants anything else from this Congress. He wants it so much that he will, I am told, make any compromise or concession on anything else necessary in order to get it. He may not have to compromise. It is easily possible he will have sufficient strength to jam it through the Senate despite the opposition. The important thing is that the President believes he must have this authority and that, without it, a successful outcome of either his agricultural or industrial-recovery policies is unlikely. In other words, the President and his close advisers regard it as vital to revive our foreign trade and believe this can be done only through scientifically effected tariff reductions and adjustments. It is clearly impossible to expect Congress to do such a job. The President believes that he alone can do it, that to do it is essential, and that, unless it is done, agriculture cannot recover and general prosperity cannot return. In this view the more thoughtful of his advisers completely concur. In fact these things were urged on him last year, when it would have been easier to obtain them. It is a matter of deep regret among some of his best friends that he has let a full year elapse before attempting what he now regards as so fundamental.

Washington. T. R. B.

Other People's Money

Physician, Well Heel Thyself!—The Weavers Stick to Their Last—Sweetness in Adversity—Friendship and Counsel

THE SALARIES of our great business apostles and saviors just brought to light by the Federal Trade Commission stir our memory about a little incident that occurred far away in the olden days of 1929. When the great market crash gave us all our first shock of fright, Mr. Hoover, it will be recalled, summoned the doctors to Washington—the doctors of business, the executives of the big corporations who had been running things. They met in solemn conclave and announced to the world that all was well. In that group of leaders was one false note, one foolish voice. It was the voice of Henry Ford. Ford said that what the country needed was purchasing power and that the way to produce that was to raise wages. He announced he would raise wages. I remember the angry, indeed the almost frantic, growls of impatience which went up from the assembled barons. In the hotels that night

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they cursed Ford for a simpleton, a grandstander, a cheap advertiser and publicity hunter. Raise wages!

Then, apparently, they all went away and thought it over. They never said anything out loud, but evidently they thought perhaps there was some middle ground; that Ford was, perhaps, partly right. And so they compromised the point and raised their own salaries. The list published by the Federal Trade Commission showing how many of the executives of big business had their salaries raised in 1930 and 1931, reveals, as by a flash of lightning, how futile it is to suppose that such men can possibly be entrusted with "charting the future pattern of American economic life." And yet they are still at the helm.

I think, in all charity, no one could be very much out of patience with the helpless and futile Hoover for calling these germ-carriers together in 1929 to try to halt the on-rushing epidemic. After all, in those days these business leaders had not been unmasked. We still supposed that a man who knew how to make a million dollars or how to run a big shoe factory necessarily knew all about the economic mechanism of the nation. But after four years of their futilities and their muddling we know better.

One of the leaders in the steel industry told me this story. He said Hoover had called him to the White House in 1930 to ask his advice about the depression. He gave it with buoyant confidence. Then in 1931 Hoover summoned him again. Again he told Hoover just what was the matter and how to end things. Whether Hoover took the medicine, I cannot say. But again one day in 1932 Hoover summoned him to the Rapidan camp. "What," asked the baffled engineer, "can possibly be done about this thing? I have tried everything I know and things continue to get worse. What can you suggest doing now?" The steel man frankly told him he didn't know and left. Then he added, relating the incident to me: "The thing that puzzled me about the incident was this. In those three ghastly years I had learned at least one thing—that I didn't know anything about it. What I can't understand is how Hoover did not also get on to me."

But why blame Hoover? In 1933, after a nation's verdict against these fellows, when a New Deal came on the stage and when we were looking for new leaders and had decided to have something resembling a planned national economic life, who were summoned to plan it? I would like to remind you that The New York Times, June 22, 1933, shortly after the N.R.A. was launched, printed an account of the appointment of a committee of forty-one to help chart the course of the country back to recovery. "Officials desired," said The Times, "that the long-range planning body be organized as speedily as possible so it might begin early to weave the pattern for the future economic life of the nation," etc.

Here are the gentlemen to whom the New Deal committed the weaving of the pattern of the future economic life of the nation:

> Robert G. Elbert, of the International Holding Company; Ralph E. Flanders, of the Jones and Lamson Machine Company; Alexander Legge, of the International Harvester Company; Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., of General Motors Corporation; Edward N. Hurley; William A. Julian, Treasurer of the United States; Robert L. Lund, of the Lambert Pharmacal Company; Pierre du Pont, of E. I. du Pont de Nemours; Dr. C. K. Leith, of the University of Wisconsin; Walter S. Gifford, of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company; H. R. Safford, of the Missouri-Pacific Railroad; William A. Harriman, of the Union Pacific Railroad; George H. Mead, of the Mead Corporation; H. P. Kendall, of the Kendall Company; Lionel J. Noah, of the American Woolen Company; George H. Baldwin, of the Disbee-Baldwin Corporation; Austin Finch, of the Thomasville Chair Company; Edmond C. Van Diest, of the General Service Corporation; Fred J. Lingham, of the National Millers' Federation; Henry H. Heimann, of the National Association of Credit Men; Thomas H. McInnerny, of National Dairy Products Corporation; James H. Rand, Jr., of Remington, Rand, Inc.; Thomas J. Watson, of the International Business Machines Corporation; Henry S. Dennison, of the Dennison Manufacturing Company; Walter C. Teagle, of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey; M. L. Benedium, oil man of Pittsburgh; Morris E. Leeds, of Leeds and Northrup; William T. Kemper, of the National Bank of Commerce, Kansas City; Gerard Swope, of General Electric; Henry I. Harriman, of the United States Chamber of Commerce; R. E. Wood, of Sears, Roebuck; A. Lincoln Filene, of William Filene's Sons; Clay Williams, of the Reynolds Tobacco Company; Fred I. Kent, of New York; De Lancey Kountze, of the Devoe and Raynolds Company; A. P. Greensfelder; Everett G. Griggs, of the St. Paul and Tacoma Lumber Company; Melvin A. Traylor, of the First National Bank of Chicago; Edward T. Stannard, of the Kennecott Copper Company; Lew Hahn, of the Hahn Department Stores; Arthur W. Little.

It would be interesting to know whose gift to the New Deal is Mr. John Dickinson, Assistant Secretary of Commerce. It is said that Mr. William Gibbs McAdoo, who gave us Roper and Comptroller O'Connor, also conferred Dickinson upon us. This gentleman, who revealed his amazing ignorance of the stock market in his appearance before the House Committee in opposition to the Stock Exchange Bill, was, on the very day of his appearance, suffering doubtless some chagrin at the stupidity of a United States Court in holding the Sugar Institute guilty of violating the Sherman Anti-Trust Law. The newspapers reported that the Sugar Institute was represented by the firm of Sullivan and Cromwell. They did not say that Mr. John Dickinson had been engaged by that firm as special counsel to represent them in defending this attempted monopoly in one of the basic necessities of life. Of course, Mr. Dickinson doubtless resigned as counsel when he became Assistant Secretary of Commerce. But he prepared the case and the case was submitted before he went into the Department as part of the New Deal.

Mr. Dickinson is a professor—a large, pompous, tremendously and almost overpoweringly important professor of law. But he has served the law firm of Sullivan and Cromwell at intervals as special counsel. This law firm represents some of the greatest and most powerful interests in Wall Street—bankers, brokers, etc. Mr. Dickinson, I once before pointed out, named a committee to study stock-market regulation and promptly put Mr. Arthur Dean of Sullivan and Cromwell on the committee. Of course, no one accuses Mr. Dickinson of being dishonest,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He doubtless believes he is serving the long-range interests of human civilization by these measures. But one cannot help wondering how a bird of such plumage manages to perch upon the New Deal. And one also keeps wondering how the outfit which is so extensively manned by these fellows gets to be called the New Deal. At all events, Mr. Dickinson spends a couple of days in Congress telling the committee that the Stock Exchange Bill is a blow at humanity, that it will wreck us, that he thinks it a mistake to try to curb margin trading, that Wall Street ought to be allowed to regulate itself and so on.

I would like to inquire of the President what he thinks this chap is doing in his official household?

JOHN T. FLYNN.

Garden Music

EDENIC calm, warmth and luxury stole on the staid Town Hall some Sundays ago, the evening the New Chamber Orchestra under young Bernard Herrmann presented Darius Milhaud's "Creation of the World" for the first time to New York City. The aromatic ballet score not only is the most perfect of the symphonic outgrowths of the style fathered by W. C. Handy of the "St. Louis Blues"; a simple, wonderfully singing, vigorously contrapuntal, richly orchestrated little structure successfully marrying jazz and J. S. Bach. It also is an almost perfect expression of the "blues'" peculiar spirit.

That is mainly nostalgic. What softly and half-articulately moans through the notes of our melancholy kind of jazz is ultimately homesickness: the perennial human homesickness for Eden and its vanished ease and warmth and peacefulness: more realistically, man's lost condition of animal freedom, gayety, irresponsibility and desire unshadowed by self-consciousness and pain. The American Negro, perhaps, first found the contemporary childish-primitive musical idiom, with its sensuous plaintiveness, crudely voicing and stilling the ancient nostalgia. But the whole world, never entirely free of the backward yearning, and specially weary, disappointed and demoralized from the War, promptly chimed in with him and joined him in some of his practical efforts to recapture the lost paradise.

Harlem arose, a city such as vision would never have conceived. And hither, in 1917, and again in 1922, came Darius Milhaud, chief member of the scandalous Parisian "Six"; and for some reason, perhaps because he was an artist and had the artist's power to develop the means necessary to the creation of tiny, illusory worlds corresponsive to his feelings, he was deeply penetrated by the spirit of the "blues," and moved to expand their nostalgic and assuaging tone into the sustained and waking dream that alone can satisfactorily retrovert men to their primitive state.

"La Création du Monde," written by him in collaboration with Blaise Cendrars and produced in Paris by the Swedish Ballet in 1923, cradles people with a representation of the pristine condition of unity they actually desire. Derived from an African legend of the creation, the action of the ballet portrays the progressive ordination of the world from out of chaos and the perfection of the edenic condition by the three giant deities of creation. Obedient to their magic, movement begins in the confused, primeval heap of things. Trees emerge from it, and various animals. The stage grows luminous while the animals turn in a dance about the bodies of the African Adam and Eve issuing gradually, limb by limb, from the central mass. The pair perform a dance of desire, while the remainder of the mass composes itself into other human beings. All join in a delirious round. The crowd finally dissolves in little groups, leaving the first pair alone, embraced in a lasting kiss amid eternal May. And Milhaud's music conveys magically the gentleness of the frabjous garden. The solemn overture softly rocks us in primordial tides. Animal gayety shakes itself free in the monkeylike fugue. Pan calls through the tender, tenderly harmonized saxophone melody in the second part; softly, sweetly, insinuatingly luring birds, beasts and men to move harmoniously with him in his perpetual spring. The sumptuous syncopes of the brass under the yodeling of the flute sing the splendor of paradisal reversions. And in the spirantlike tones of the flutter-tongued flutes concluding the score, life has become the sweet bubbling of the cane and the sounds on baby lips.

PAUL ROSENFELD.

Genesis, 19:8

I AM SHOCKED and somewhat delighted by the strange mixture of fact and fancy which is "Lot in Sodom." Although it is almost two months now that this two-reel film has been showing in New York City (where you can still see it at the Acme Theatre), it has been either so ignored by reviewers or so learnedly obscured with generalities that nobody seems to gather the least idea what it is about, or why. Obviously it retells the Biblical fable of the fall of Sodom. And surely it is a lolloping stride toward some technical end of grave import. But incidentally and to speak plain truth, it also gets good and bawdy before it has done. Whatever the main intent of the directors, there is just enough concern for realism in the matter of how Sodom took its pleasure (Lot offering his daughter as an incentive to the Natural Life, and the boys indignant; the angel of the Lord arriving and they making what are called passes at him), and there is just enough of the uncalled for in the conception and birth interlude, to suggest something of an exercise in seeing how much you can get away with.

But if I hint that there have been several tongues in several cheeks during the film's execution, it is nothing against the serious artistry of the non-professional group which, headed by Messrs. J. Sibley Watson, Jr., and Melville Webber, has made it possible. The directors have made great headway in the evolution of a style, of a manner of statement peculiar to their own medium: what is more important, they have got something to use it for, something to say. But speaking in symbols, they essay to walk too far and fast, and stumble. They seem to have forgotten that symbolic art-forms—poetry, painting, the like—require a leisure for reëxamination that is denied the stage. Because the life of the stage is a life in time, actual in one moment and committed to experience in the next, its movements must be clear and memorable. And any complexity thrown into the inexorable tempo of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

present movie must fail to take the observer all the way with it.

Essentially, though, the desired impression is got across, and that is much. You know that in this city you would be afraid. Not with the simple terror bred of war-whoops and maelstroms: you would be afraid of what the directors have captured here—possibly the Spirit of Evil. By casting types whose feminine bent is made only more sinister through its superimposition upon a brutal masculinity; by the manipulation of focus toward the end of distortion, dismemberment, inversion and grotesque movement—by these varied means and with the incidental aid of fire, smoke, lightning and modern orchestration, the directors go beyond the fact of Sodom to their special feeling for it. Despite the pleasing absence of moral purpose, and the beauty which attends much of its unrolling, the story makes sin very sinful, heartily repellant. A person could say, in fact: For God's sake go see "Lot in Sodom," and be literally justified.

The only fine thing noticeable in Pathé-Natan's "Ariane" is that in knocking the sense out of Claude Anet's fine novel of that name, it creates a part through which Elizabeth Bergner can move without a trace of strain. You would not know from her work in "Catherine" that this slight creature could so consistently take your breath away with the clear grace and intelligence of her style. Here, shorn of the pretentious, she is a lovely spirit, and enough to make even this silly film a pleasure to watch. . . . One other waste of celluloid that has been made pleasant by an unspoiled character is "Palooka," a prizefight story not quite able to contain Mr. James (Schnozzle) Durante, who —in his own uncontainable and somewhat muggish way— is lovely too, though I doubt he ever would admit it.

OTIS C. FERGUSON.

CORRESPONDENCE

Freedom to Laugh

SIR: Charles A. Beard, in his letter in The New Republic of January 3, raises the question in respect to the lecture tour of Professor Schönemann of the University of Berlin: "Who is paying his bills?" I personally cannot answer this nor am I the least bit interested therein. I would merely like to ask: what difference does it make?

The inference seems to be that the German government is financing it as a part of its propaganda campaign. That is neither unlikely nor unnatural. But even if that is the case, is it sufficient ground for the inhospitable treatment of a foreigner that Professor Beard proposes when he says: "A loud guffaw should greet him whenever he appears"?

Such an expression might be natural from a backwoods rowdy who had no feeling for such a thing as fair play. But it is surprising to find this attitude in such a man as Professor Beard, who is generally thought to belong to the intellectual and liberal group in our country.

It is self-evident that the spirit of Professor Beard's utterance is contradictory to our "free speech" tradition. Or is our notion of free speech such that the public shall only hear anti-German propaganda handed out by New York Jewry? If so, our freedom of speech is no more real freedom than that here in Germany where Nazi censorship allows only Nazi propaganda to reach the people . . . .

HOMER G. RICHEY.

Göttingen, Germany.

SIR: With a discrimination truly Nazi Mr. Richey has missed the point of my letter on Professor Schönemann. The matter of the source from which the learned Professor's pay came is a side issue. The heart of the business is that the learned Professor, in his book on influencing the masses in the United States, rated American intelligence near the bottom of the scale and then came over to appeal to that intelligence for Hitler and Company. To make it clearer to Mr. Richey, I should say that it is like calling a man a subnormal fool and then making an appeal to his "intelligence" to gain his approval and support. It seems to me that such an operation should make any American who is not a moron want to laugh out loud, that is, raise a guffaw. This is not a suggestion that the learned Professor be suppressed in the United States, but merely that laughter should greet his oratory. Doubtless Mr. Richey will not be able to make the distinction, but an Artemus Ward or a Petroleum V. Nasby could. . . .

Riverside, Calif. CHARLES A. BEARD.

Toplofty Reviewing

SIR: Mr. F. C. Hartshorne's point is well taken [The New Republic, January 17], and I acknowledge the error of confusing the St. Augustine whose chair we are shown in Canterbury Cathedral with the Bishop of whom Miss West wrote. This, however, does not affect the soundness of my criticism, that her book is not so much about the life of St. Augustine as about what Miss West thinks that life might have been. Perhaps, if Miss West's book had contained more information of the humbler kind I might not have made the error.

The suggestion of a New Deal for the consumer of reviews seems to me of more importance than either my erudition or Miss West's. As a reviewer myself, I have found that unless I keep in mind the principle that we must think ourselves into the position of the author of the book and judge him or her on that basis, the review is not a fair one. I do not say that we can always achieve that position of supreme charity. I only say that, unless we develop a technique that will permit us to achieve it, we are lost, and become toplofty.

The review to which I took exception, and which has provoked this discussion, is a case in point. Miss West did not seem to care what Mr. Benson's outlook was. She ignored the fact that the son of an archbishop and the author of that fascinating book, "As We Were," with its memories of early associations with royalty, would have a special outlook upon Edward the Seventh. Instead of reviewing the book as written by Mr. Benson, Miss West ignored it and gave us what may or may not be the truth. It had nothing to do with the case. To sneer at a man, who has written an excellent biography, as a mediocre novelist had no bearing on the matter. St. Beuve was a mediocre novelist, but he was a first-rate critic. Arthur Weigall was a mediocre novelist, but he was a first-rate Egyptologist. Shelley was an execrable novelist, but he was a first-rate poet. As a matter of fact, Mr. Benson has no need to be defended as a novelist. He has written some bad ones—I reviewed one long ago. But he has also written some extremely good ones, of which even the reviewers for The New Republic might not be ashamed.

I had noticed an increasing number of The New Republic's reviewers adopting what I called a toplofty attitude towards their authors, and as this attitude caused me to feel irritated instead of instructed, I thought that others might feel the same. The tone of many of your correspondents convinces me that I was on the right track.

I have on a previous occasion protested against the toplofty school of reviewers. When a review of Mrs. C. Q. Leavis' "Fiction

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the Reading Public" appeared in your columns, anyone who had not read that important work would have imagined that it was a thesis by some immature college girl.

The weak spot of such reviewing is that it lacks the human touch. It remains oblivious of the fact that the book sneered at was written by a human being in some sort of heat and passion, and if it be any good at all it will be read by other human beings in a kindred heat and passion. The good reviewer has a heat and passion of his own and so sheds illumination and warmth upon the book and its theme.

WILLIAM MCFEE.

Westport, Conn.

[Now that Mr. McFee has stated his objections in more general terms, and without the note of personal animosity against Miss Rebecca West which his first letter seemed to express, we agree with him in large part. Reviews that lack the human touch are certainly far inferior to those that possess it, and critics ought to be frequently reminded that they are invested with no divine prerogative. On the other hand, Mr. McFee might remember that in his critical remarks about Miss West he has violated his own principles. He has been so intent on telling what her review failed to do that he has toploftily neglected to give it credit for what it actually was—a brilliant and interesting discussion of the psychology of Edward VII. As for the letter from Mr. H. W. Eliot, printed below, we agree with it almost wholly. Toploftiness and timidity do go hand in hand, and it's about time that both qualities disappeared from American criticism. They might well be replaced by enthusiasm, kindliness and forthright anger.—THE EDITORS.]

SIR: It seems to me rather a pity that Mr. McFee's case has been thrown out of court because of the "howler" that he committed (which, after all, apparently got by the editors before it was printed). For that point, after all, was irrelevant; what Mr. McFee charged was that The New Republic's reviewers are toplofty. And I should still like to see that point adjudicated.

What is meant by "toplofty"? I should say that it means superior, supercilious, smug, sophisticated, snooty, snobbish. I don't know why these synonyms are alliterative; it just happens so. But the question is important, for it seems to me that the value of criticism is diminished by contamination with these elements. And I do not see how anyone can deny that a school of criticism has flourished, in the last two decades, which is to some degree thus contaminated.

In its attitude toward the creative artist himself, however, his new school is not damnatory, but laudatory. It differs from older schools in that its function is priestly rather than pedagogical. Its ministrants stand between the artist and the public, not as interpreters, but as guardians of the sacred books and holy icons, things hidden, and to be kept hidden, from profane understanding; mysteries not to be elucidated but to be celebrated. It is quasi-religious; a cult of culture; a substitute for religion. In an age of disillusion, when everything else has been explained away, it satisfies the Need of Marvel.

The school is infallible. It teaches that Joyce never wrote a superfluous word and Cézanne never made a bad painting. Cultural salvation is in its keeping, and it holds the power of excommunication. It has a short way with dissenters, and no threats of hell-fire from the pulpit ever terrified backsliders more than the thunderings of its hierophants against those weaklings who succumb to the wiles of Satan, who in its theology is known as Babbitt.

It is hardly seemly to describe such a powerful theocracy as toplofty; yet it must be remembered that in many past ages there has been a tendency for the priestly class to arrogate unto itself honors and dignities which would have astonished the prophets whom it professed to adore.

The activities of this school, however, though they furnish spiritual comforts to a large body of followers, are not, I submit, criticism. They have, on the contrary, succeeded in almost wholly suppressing free and independent opinion. They have propagated instead a bulky literature of obnubilation, tergiversation, equivocation, circumlocution and evasion. A new work of art appears; is it or is it not a certified miracle? No commentator can say, until it has received high approval. No writer dare expound the work intelligibly, lest he be entangled in heresy. Hence he goes obscurantist for safety. And I contend that obscurantism, while it has its legitimate part in a work of art, has no place in critical writing. . . .

Toploftiness, then, is the obverse of the medal that I would pin on contemporary critics, and the reverse is timidity. Psychologically, I believe the two traits often occur together. Whether they occur in New Republic reviewers, I hesitate to say. That would require some qualifications and careful discrimination.

H. W. ELIOT.

New York City.

Aristocracy on the Eastern Shore

SIR: It is necessary to protest against the opinion expressed by Gerald W. Johnson in his article "Maryland: Storm Warning" [The New Republic, December 20] that Eastern Shoremen in their recent battle with state troops had deeper motives than the protection of their brother lynchers. The Governor of Maryland is an "aristocrat" and has surrounded himself with "gentlemanly fellows" according to Johnson, and the Eastern Shoremen have "lost confidence in government by gentlemen." Whether one regards the reigning powers in Maryland today as gentleman depends upon one's conception of the term; it is sufficient here to record that Mr. Johnson's idea has not the dignity of universal acceptance. Be that as it may, the slightest familiarity with the situation in Maryland reveals the absurdity of Mr. Johnson's opinion that there was in the rioting the dim echo of revolution.

There has been no issue in all the Shore trouble but racial hatred. It is the class to which the Governor belongs that has been most outspoken on the virture of lynching as a means of keeping the Negro in his place. The letters of protest to The Baltimore Sun for its gallant stand frequently begin with a statement of the writer's pedigree, with the evident intention of confirming the historic fact that pedigree and predaciousness are unalterably allied. And in every instance the list of ancestors reads like the Governor's own—early settlers, colonial Governors and slave holders. The most vitriolic reply to Mencken's disclosure of Eastern Shore decadence two years ago was signed by a Tilghman. Although the lynching mobs include all classes of people, the ideology of the mobs is that of the old Southern ruling class, the sort of people that Frederick Bancroft exposed so brilliantly in his "Slave Trading in the Old South." The Shoremen were naturally shocked that Ritchie, who had quietly acquiesced in their savagery for so long, suddenly took action against them. But to suppose that of such people and such ideology revolutions are made is to expose oneself to the ridicule of thinking people. The truth of the matter is that when bread is scarce, lynchings provide highly satisfactory circuses.

Since Mr. Johnson, a Southerner like myself, writes "aristocrat" not in quotation marks, but quite seriously without them, I assume that he believes there is in our section such an animal. For his enlightenment I suggest the chapter "The Southern Pattern" in V. F. Calverton's "The Liberation of American Literature."

Baltimore, Md. VERA FULTON.

Extracts from Letters

ARTHUR E. MORGAN, president of Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio, and, of course, a director of the T.V.A., has been asked by Houghton Mifflin to write a biography of Edward Bellamy, the author of "Looking Backward." Bellamy carried on a considerable correspondence during the latter years of his life and President Morgan will be grateful to receive copies of such letters or information about where any may be found.

The Economic Committee of the National Advisory Council on Radio Education, in coöperation with the League for Industrial Democracy, will present a series of radio broadcasts over the red network of the National Broadcasting Company on "The Economics of the New Deal." The broadcasts will take place between 5:30 and 6 P.M. on Saturdays during March, April and May.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Adventurous America

IT IS an old experience for Americans to learn about themselves from books written to enlighten other nations. De Tocqueville did it for us in the early part of the nineteenth century, from the French point of view; Bryce later, and from the English. Recent books, like those of Siegfried, have been more journalistic and superficial. Professor Bonn is the first German to do us the honor in a full-dress work.[1] The outline and contents of his book suggest a return to the thoroughgoing, serious study. He starts with a geographical base—the country; he then populates it with the various kinds and races of people who inhabit this nation; he describes the state and the political scene; he discusses economic institutions and opinions; he estimates our culture in a section on the influence and decline of Puritanism, and he ends with a section on the success of our adventure. Within this framework, he writes far more like the competent journalistic traveler than like the scholar. His information is amazingly complete and accurate; his observations are usually true and often shrewd; but in the end the book adds up to very little. It seems more a smoothly written compilation than a closely integrated analysis. Professor Bonn is one of those gifted individuals who easily take on the color of their mental environment and as easily shed it. This quality makes it difficult for Americans to learn from the book much of advantage to themselves.

Because we have no hereditary aristocracy, and our government, established by revolution, proclaimed the idea of equality, Dr. Bonn draws the conclusion that in this country there are no ruling traditions, that we do not value the past for its own sake, that we desire novelty and expect the new to be better than the old. He believes we are fundamentally of revolutionary and rationalistic temper. It will be a surprise to many Americans to read:

> Over and above this glorification of the revolutionary because it is revolutionary, rational purpose and conscious design dominate the American mind. A nation whose ancestors forsook their old homes with the deliberate intention of founding a new society habitually indulges in social planning on an extensive scale. Everywhere the Americans are trying to replace a time-made state of affairs by a man-made order of things. In the realm of applied science this spirit of purposeful planning is common to the whole modern world. But only in America has it governed social life in its entirety from the beginning.

Elsewhere he speaks of an American tendency to judge everything by quantitative standards, and to use quantitative measurement as the basis of a creative social science. Apparently his views on this subject have been colored by contact with a small school of American economists who have emphasized the statistical method, as opposed to the older deductive theory or the German historical school. It is true, of course, that America as a whole tends to emphasize size rather than quality, but this is a type of value-judgment rather than the employment of rational planning. Technically we have been inventive, and are scornful of precedent in our mechanical advances; but those who have striven, against great odds, to introduce even minor bits of social planning can testify to the fact that there is obstinate resistance, which calls to its defense the tradition of early nineteenth-century individualism. A nation which bases its traditions on a previous revolution may be even less hospitable to social and political changes in the present than one in which traditions have a less rationalized origin.

Much more to the point is Dr. Bonn's description of the American radical temper in a later section of his book:

> Social unrest is rarely condensed into a scientific system which strives after distant and carefully thought-out ends. It is rather inclined to bubble over in a sudden uprush of excited sentiment requiring immediate realization of its demands. German radicalism was a pursuit of ideas theoretically profound and practically harmless. It was always in the habit of thinking out its problems relentlessly to the end: when it believed it had discovered the solution it was but mildly interested in seeing that solution realized. American radicalism, on the other hand, is satisfied when it has got hold of the salient corners and edges of a program. As soon as it has become possessed of a half-baked idea it wants to work it out to a finish. . . . The American nation is impatient: with all its good humor, it has a tendency to violence.

This is the opposite of planning; it is an admirable characterization of the average American response to the depression and, indeed, of the national government's action. Doing something takes precedence over careful advance thought; we shall learn to plan through the hard knocks of experience and class conflict.

Dr. Bonn's chapter on economics is more in the nature of social and political science than of economic principles. He shows why the American workman has in the past had so little class consciousness, and correctly estimates the significance of the disappearance of free land and the diminution of the chance to become a successful independent business man. In order to satisfy the worker, American industry must pay high wages; it must, indeed, find a wide distribution for its products in order to prosper at all. One gathers the impression that this part of the book was written largely under the spell of the "new era." Dr. Bonn is scarcely critical enough of the pretensions of widespread stock ownership by employees, of instalment selling as a means of widening the market for consumers' goods. But he truly states the problem that business will now have to solve if capitalism is to survive. The instinct for egalitarianism, stopped off from the old channels of escape and restless for immediate results, will run head on into a chronic inability of capitalist industry to increase the general standard of living.

Another shrewd passage estimates the danger of American imperialism. American business does not want to govern others, but rather to sell to them. But suppose backward areas resist its capitalistic colonization? We have our own peculiar sense of historic mission. We want to convert and elevate. It is conceivable "that government by saints may result in greater dangers to the world than government by sinners, as the sinners know something of the business of empire, while the saints may be trying to establish the empire of business."

Few of Dr. Bonn's discussions are carried to any de-

[1] The American Adventure, by M. J. Bonn. New York: The John Day Company. 330 pages. $2.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cision. He compares the forces at work, sketches possibilities, and then fails to answer the questions he raises. His final remarks, however, indicate a very deep flaw. The original promise of American life requires a different redemption from any we have yet seen. For a short time we had a glimpse of economic liberation during prosperity, and after many years of struggle with Puritanism we seem to be acquiring spiritual freedom. But what are these freedoms worth to us? "There are many pleasures, there is little joy. The old creed had chilled the soul; the new faith does not yet warm the heart. . . . The art of living, on the North American continent, is only beginning."

GEORGE SOULE.

Ruskin Psychoanalyzed

John Ruskin: An Introduction to Further Study of His Life and Work, by R. H. Wilenski. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company. 406 pages. $4.50.

PSYCHOANALYSIS can be of value to a biographer so long as it is pursued critically and with caution. There is plausibility in Mr. Wilenski's hypothesis that Ruskin was a manic-depressive, and that some of the effects of the malady—an impulse to preach, a carelessness of detail, an excessive self-confidence—are frequently evident in his writings. But Mr. Wilenski has apparently no love for partial statements. There is hardly a page of Ruskin's writings that can be properly understood, he declares, until it is collated with the state of mind and the circumstances not only of the general period but often of the very day on which it was written. Accordingly the book begins with ten pages of synoptic tables in which the chronological sequence of Ruskin's writings is developed along with corresponding changes in "events," "repute" and "health," listed in parallel columns. Then follows a well informed and readable account of Ruskin's life, in which such factors as his resentment against maternal tyranny, his love for Rose LaTouche, his later unsuccessful marriage to Euphemia Gray and her desertion are introduced as variously explaining many of his opinions on art and society. The latter half of the book is devoted to a critical account of Ruskin's philosophy. Here I found Wilenski disappointing. His insistence on the psychoanalytic approach, in spite of his absurd claim that it can make "every word" of Ruskin comprehensible, brings obscurity and bias into his treatment of the material. He expounds Ruskin fairly only where he agrees with him. Elsewhere he is patronizing, cynical and indifferent to the probable meaning of what Ruskin has tried to say.

In order to show that Turner's landscapes were "truer to nature" than those of "the various Van somethings and Back somethings" with which the National and Dulwich Galleries were filled, Ruskin created a number of remarkable word-portraits of morning on the plains, noon with gathering storms, sunset in tempest, serene midnight, and used these descriptions as criteria by which to gauge the degree of truth in the various paintings he was comparing. Thus, says Wilenski, "we see him convinced that the parade of his own experience is the proclamation of 'the perfectness and eternal beauty of the work of God,'" that he was divinely appointed to exhibit and explain that perfectness and beauty, and that God had given him a sign of this by curing him of diphtheria. None of these charges is stated fairly. It is misleading to talk of Ruskin's parading his own experience unless it is added that he was assiduous, perhaps more than any other critic, in educating that experience by a study of nature's changing moods—examining the shapes of rocks and of flower petals, testing with his cyanometer the blue of skies, noting each effect of light on mountains, on water, on sprigs of ivy. Nor was Ruskin's belief in the divine source of his vocation necessarily egomania, for "God gives *every man* certain gifts which enable him to fulfill some particular function, and I don't think my fondness for hills and streams . . . was given me merely to be thwarted" (italics mine). When his diphtheria was cured in answer, as he believed, to prayer, the result of the experience was no such burst of vanity as Wilenski pretends, but simply "a thrill of conscious happiness altogether new to me."

In architecture Ruskin had the wit to see that "the time is probably near when a new system of architectural laws will be developed, adapted entirely to metallic construction," but he foresaw too that the development of metallic construction, by promoting to excess the division of labor, would destroy the creative instinct in workmen. It was for him a condition of good art that the craftsmen producing it should be employed happily and creatively. But as soon as one works creatively and the imagination becomes active, "the enginelike precision" of the product is lost. Ruskin concluded that only those aspects of architecture are worthy to be called art in which the hand of the individual craftsman is seen. There was no artistic worth, therefore, in the mere proportions of a building; the divine part was the sculpture, painting and mosaic, which turned "dead walls into living ones." This doctrine, of course, runs counter to modern tendencies in architecture, and Wilenski, a diehard modernist, is properly scornful. But Ruskin, whatever his inadequacies, drew attention to a problem (even though without satisfactorily answering it) of which modernist theories are finding it necessary to take account—the relation of architectural excellence to the sociological factors involved in the process of construction.

PHILIP WHEELWRIGHT.

Prelude to Hitler

The Machine Unchained, by Leo Hausleiter. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 391 pages. $3.

The Rationalization Movement in German Industry: A Study in the Evolution of Economic Planning, by Robert A. Brady. Berkeley: University of California Press. 487 pages. $5.

THESE two books deal with the economic background of the present crisis in Germany. "The Machine Unchained" is a most ambitious and impressive performance, including in its pages a sweeping survey of the development of world capitalism, an extensive account of the reasons for Germany's economic collapse (that collapse in which the rationalization movement described by Professor Brady played such an important part) and an outline of th Third Reich of the future.

Herr Hausleiter opens his book with a lively and dramatic summary of the revolution wrought in the world economic system by the technical development of the forces of production. With mingled fear and fascination he follows the course of capitalist expansion during the nineteenth century under the irresistible demands of industrial Europe for new markets. The periodical crises incidental to this unparalleled century of progress he views as healthy signs of growth, temporary pauses in the triumphant march of the machine.

The great crises which wrack twentieth-century Europe

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(and to Hausleiter the World War was only a more violent crisis) are struggles for the very survival of the capitalist countries. The machine, willing servant of capitalist enterprise in the nineteenth century, now revenges itself upon its former masters. The industrialization of backward countries and the mechanization of extensive agriculture make it increasingly difficult for Europe to compete in the world market with extra-European countries. The parents of capitalism stand in danger of being devoured by their progeny, the mass economies of Russia and the United States. Germany in particular, whose whole economy is built upon the necessity of manufacturing for export, will soon be reduced to exporting nothing but "optical goods and professors."

The only escape from this intolerable situation, says Hausleiter, is for Germany to retreat within its own frontiers. The unbridled productivity of the machine must be shackled. Imperialism must be abandoned outside the state; private capitalism and economic liberalism must be abandoned within it. A central authority must control and coördinate all economic activity. Bolshevism is the alternative unless the German middle class succeeds in organizing this corporate state by reëstablishing the peasant proprietor as the fundamental unit of German economy.

Thus Herr Hausleiter conducts Germany to the threshold of Hitler's coming to power. The feasibility of his solution is now being tested in the crucible of events. A year of Nazi dictatorship makes it plain that Hausleiter's sweet land of autarchy is an unrealizable dream. Every contraction in the sphere of foreign trade produces corresponding convulsions within Germany, making the need for imperialist expansion greater and greater and disclosing the fundamental flaw in any scheme of intense nationalism such as he proposes.

The fate of the sort of planning he advocates is foreshadowed in Professor Brady's admirable study of the evolution of an earlier experiment in industrial planning. He describes the rationalization movement which from 1924 to 1929 was the hope of the German middle classes. Its disillusioning failure to provide any permanent prosperity accounts for their willingness to adopt the desperate expedients of Hitlerism. Professor Brady's book leads straight to the conclusion that the rationalization of German industry produced the irrationalism of Fascism.

GEORGE E. NOVACK.

Dewey on Thought and Action

How We Think: A Restatement of the Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process, by John Dewey. New York: D. C. Heath and Company. 301 pages. $2.

IN TECHNICAL philosophical circles, John Dewey's thoroughgoing naturalism has earned him the reputation of being a non-rationalist. At the same time his emphasis upon the instrumental character of reflection, his contention that experimental thinking is not only relevant to the solution of all genuine problems but more effective than any available alternative, has led some of his social critics to regard him as a utopian rationalist whose primary achievement has been to fashion the techniques of liberal compromise.

As this book clearly indicates, both characterizations arise from a failure to consider the nature of Dewey's naturalism and the distinctive aspects of his analysis of the thinking process. Dewey's naturalism does not deny the importance and necessity of standards in evaluating natural activities—which is the essence of critical rationalism—but seeks to make the *application* of standards intelligible by inquiring into their origins, development and consequences. On the other hand, the most outstanding feature of Dewey's analysis of thinking is his demonstration that at some determinate point in the thought process, concrete activity is involved. This is not to say that thinking exists for the sake of action, but that activity is an integral part of the total life history of any thought.

The kind of action which thinking involves depends upon the subject matter thought about and the specific purposes out of which the problem arises. It is obvious that the activity demanded in thinking through an astronomical problem—observation, manipulation of apparatus, etc.—will be different from the activity involved in carrying out a strike or a revolution. There is, therefore, nothing in the experimental conception of thinking which is incompatible with a social program more conservative or more radical than Dewey's own—with one provision. That social program must contain no principle which is taken as self-evidently true and beyond the test of the consequences that flow from its application. For it is only when we know what the consequences of our principles are that we know what they mean.

Although Dewey's "How We Think" has long been a classic among educators and psychologists, what makes this extensively revised and almost completely rewritten edition noteworthy is the consideration given to objections which have accumulated over a period of more than twenty years. The place of curiosity in thinking, the relation of formal to material elements in logic, the nature of value-appreciation, the unity of process and product—and the bearing of all this on the newer tendencies of experimental education—receive amplified and illuminating development.

One cannot help regretting the absence of a section on the historical context and function of ideas. Mr. Dewey has elsewhere treated of this theme, but very briefly. In view of its contemporary importance, it would have been appropriate to consider the question at some length.

SIDNEY HOOK.

Farrell's Best Novel

The Young Manhood of Studs Lonigan, by James T. Farrell. New York: The Vanguard Press. $2.50.

FARRELL is writing a series of novels dealing with an element in American life that has been scarcely touched upon in fiction. He has forged a technique both original and exactly suited to his purpose. That purpose is to make the world see and know and come to understand his people for what they are, inside and out. Thus, the representation is flatly naturalistic but brilliantly accurate and convincing; and at the same time the psychological note is always present. Without being too serious about it, one might venture the remark that Studs, as a literary creation, is the bastard offspring of "Babbitt" and "Ulysses." Well, he is an Irish-American, of an American Catholic family, and his milieu is predominantly American-Irish-Catholic.

One fears that a great deal of nonsense will be written about this extraordinary work. It is not about "gangsters" as that word has come to be used in connection with organized crime. It is not about the Chicago "slums," or about hobos, sports, gunmen and suchlike colorful and exotic characters. It is not about the despised and rejected of men. Studs comes from a respectable Irish-American-Catholic home, one generation removed from the home of an immi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grant laborer. The Lonigans are well off. The Fifty-eighth Street gang is a shifting bunch of "tough" youngsters, street-corner sports, poolroom sharks and so on. It includes the athletically ambitious Studs, the really vicious Weary Reilly, innocent goofs like Vinc Curley, a half-wit comedian like Kenny Killarney, and an intelligent youngster, going on with his education, like Danny O'Neil (a minor character who is the autobiographical figure in the Lonigan books and also in Farrell's "Gas House McGinty"). A gang like this may be found in hundreds of big-city neighborhoods and in every small city from New England to California. Studs is as indigenous as Babbitt to American city life. All this may strike Farrell's perceptive readers as gratuitous, as a naïve attempt to set things straight. But in the light of what has been written by many of Farrell's reviewers it seems to me that some such plain statement is called for.

This is not only Farrell's best book and, together with "Young Lonigan," an important contribution to the picture of American life as our novelists portray it; it is also a distinguished and outstanding contemporary novel. To the American reader who, whether bored or amused, is not self-conscious about seeing in print the kind of talk that would be bandied about in the Greek's poolroom by the Fifty-eighth Street gang, who doesn't have to swallow his naturalism as though he were taking a dose of castor oil, who doesn't feel called upon to write or talk apologetically about it, "The Young Manhood of Studs Lonigan" is recommended as an absorbing novel, a book of significance, a great piece of American realism. One pushes through it with accelerating speed, unable to drop the thing. And it leaves one shaken.

FRED T. MARSH.

Social and Economic Changes

will require special efforts in adjusting and integrating Jewish life with the American scene.

These efforts call for special knowledge and skill. The Graduate School for Jewish Social Work aims to supply both in a course of study for college graduates leading to the Master's and Doctor's degrees.

For full information regarding qualifications for admission, scholarships and fellowships, write to

DR. M. J. KARPF, *Director*

The Graduate School For Jewish Social Work

71 West 47th Street New York City

Esculapians

The Great Doctors: A Biographical History of Medicine, by Dr. Henry E. Sigerist. Translated by Eden and Cedar Paul. New York: W. W. Norton and Company. 436 pages, illustrated. $4.

DR. SIGERIST, who teaches the History of Medicine at Johns Hopkins, is no vulgarizer of his subject, but neither does he write about it abstrusely or in a forbidding style. His aim is to tell the story of "the exceptional beings who enriched the healing art with new outlooks, who forged new weapons in the fight against disease." In a scholarly and entertaining fashion, he deals with some fifty medical pioneers, from Imhotep and the mythical Esculapius to the brilliant Canadian, Sir William Osler.

Limitations of space reduce the treatment of American medicine to some four pages and six names in the chapter on Osler, including William Beaumont, who anticipated Bernard's researches on digestion. The immense importance of bacteriology is fully recognized, but since the principle of selection excludes living scientists, recent work on viruses and the bacteriophage, on hormones, vitamins and endocrinology, is neglected. Two of the author's omissions are regrettable. He does not even give a passing mention to Patrick Manson, the great English pioneer in tropical medicine. Considering that he draws some attention to the work of Laveran on isolating the malaria parasite in the blood, surely he might have added a brief discussion of Manson's protégé, Sir Ronald Ross, who, in the face of almost universal skepticism, definitely proved that this parasite was associated with the *anopheles* mosquito.

Nevertheless, Dr. Sigerist has written a book of high merit, perhaps the best treatment of medical history available to the general reader, and one which no serious student of the medical sciences can afford to neglect. Its value is enhanced by many illustrations and an excellent short bibliography.

HAROLD WARD.

Behind the Doctor, by Logan Clendening. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 487 pages. $3.75.

DR. CLENDENING believes that "the layman does not grasp the significance of great medical discoveries in the form of straight historical narrative." This is his reason for presenting a large part of his material in fictional form, inventing data where documentary facts are incomplete. His attitude is apparently similar to that of radio broadcasters who think that the American public cannot listen to a Haydn symphony without first hearing a dramatization of the composer's life. And as the one gives us poor drama and worse music, so the other gives us weak fiction and preposterous history.

The author traces the origins of the fundamental sciences of anatomy and physiology, their growth and their application to the practical problems of medicine and surgery. He emphasizes the early work in the prevention of disease, such as Jenner's discovery of vaccination and the tragic, ineffectual efforts of Semmelweis to teach his colleagues that they were themselves causing childbed fever by careless examinations and care of mothers, resulting in an appalling maternal death rate. Only in recent weeks this topic has again occupied the front pages of our newspapers. The book ends with a brief account of recent discoveries, including the magnificent work in Boston of Minot and Murphy, who demonstrated the curative powers of liver in the dreaded blood disease, pernicious anemia. Perhaps the best feature of the book is the lengthy quotations from old his-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

torical works, such as Louise Bourgeois' description of her attendance at the birth of Louis XIII of France.

The history of medicine, paralleling as it does the record of general scientific progress and portraying the development of an idealism almost unique in this world, has an essential fascination difficult to destroy. Dr. Clendening's book, however, can hardly be considered an important or significant contribution to the subject. In his efforts to interest his readers, he has only cheapened it.

DAVID BERES, M.D.

Books in Brief

BELLES LETTRES

THE SPIRIT OF FRANCE, by Paul Cohen-Portheim. *New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 215 pages. $3.*

This book is essentially a catalogue, interspersed with generalizations, of and about the French traits already described by a hundred writers. Mr. Cohen-Portheim plunges into French history and finds the key to these national traits in the Gothic era, and particularly in Gothic architecture, which to him seems "a cheerful art . . . letting in the many-colored light through vast windows, shooting up toward the sun like a great tree, yet never losing control or bursting into excess." "Control" is the key word, and the author majestically rules out everything in French history or contemporary life which it does not explain. He talks at length about the humanizing influence of the French salon and its mistresses; about French gardens and fashions and cooking, yet he gives but a bare mention to the 90 percent of the French people for whom these well regulated sweets are all but unknown. Toward the end of the book, Mr. Cohen-Portheim advances an unexpected plea—that France should take the lead in transcending European nationalism and become the center of a supernational Europe. One is not surprised to learn that the book, although only recently translated, was written in 1926. Mr. Cohen-Portheim was a poor prophet.

P. S.

WORLD POLITICS

WHITHER LATIN AMERICA, by Frank Tannenbaum. *New York: Thomas Y. Crowell. 205 pages. $2.*

Mr. Tannenbaum, one of the leading authorities on our Southern neighbors, has made a survey of Latin America for the purpose of formulating a program of research. In this valuable volume the author does much more than point out the existence of numerous problems; he also states his own beliefs. The most interesting and important observation is that, contrary to general assumptions, Latin America will not develop an industrial civilization similar to that of Europe or the United States. According to Mr. Tannenbaum, Latin America has no large-scale industrial future. It must rely upon the outside world for mechanized products, and must pay for them by the export of raw materials. The limited market for such exports, however, automatically sets a limit upon the extent to which it may import industrialized products. At the same time he believes that "there is a vast and unknown field of household and village industries that remains unstudied."

PEACE BY REVOLUTION: An Interpretation of Mexico, by Frank Tannenbaum. *New York: Columbia University Press. 325 pages. $3.50.*

Mr. Tannenbaum here leads his readers through the veritable maze of events in Mexico since the Revolution. It is no small task to explain to the English-speaking public the difficulties which faced the revolutionists after the downfall of Díaz. Here was a country owned and governed by people of Spanish blood, while the masses of the population were Indians separated from the rulers by race, distance, customs and speech. Even the semblance of unity which Mexico has today is in remarkable contrast to the chaos existing at the beginning of the reconstruction period. Until 1910 the agrarian movement was a utopian ideal; now Mr. Tannen-

An important contribution to the literature of that "New Morality" which is growing up among thinking people

THE ETHICS of SEXUAL ACTS

By René Guyon

With an Introduction and Notes By Dr. NORMAN HAIRE

"THIS book impressed me as one of the most important contributions to sexological literature that I had ever read, and it seemed to me important that it should be made available to English-speaking students of Sexology.

"The author is a Frenchman who has travelled in many countries and spent a great part of his life in the East. This circumstance has enabled him to observe and consider sexual phenomena in relation to the varying codes of sexual morality which obtain in different parts of the world.

"M. Guyon comes to some startling conclusions concerning sexual responsibility, modesty, and the justifiability of the general taboos affecting the sexual organs and sexual acts. He makes a penetrating study of the phenomenon of modesty, traces the origin of sexual taboos, discusses chastity and condemns its exaltation as a virtue, and proceeds to attribute to our present sexual ethic the prevalence of unhappiness and neurosis.

"He proceeds to the discussion of onanism, incest, homosexuality, fetichism, and even such 'extraordinary' variations as necrophilia and coprophilia, all of which he considers to fall within the limits of the normal.

"He concludes with a brilliant analysis of what is usually called "love"—he prefers the term "individualized love"—and asserts that its exaltation, at the expense of other forms of sexual expression, is unjustified."—*NormanHaire*

410 pages $4.00

CONTENTS

I Sexuality.
II Freud—infantile and primitive sexuality.
III The physiology of sexuality.
IV The morality of sexual acts.
V The sexual taboo and its origin.
VI The triumph of sexual taboo.
VII Chastity as the complement of sexual taboo.
VIII The neuroses due to sexual repression.
IX The mechanistic theory of sexuality in its relation to morals.
X The psychophysiology of the so-called sexual aberrations.
XI Individualized love.
XII Conclusion.
Index.

Alfred • A • Knopf BORZOI BOOKS 730 Fifth Ave • N • Y •

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

baum gives us maps indicating land which has been returned to the Indian and the amount which must still be distributed before any lasting benefit may be obtained. Rural education, the author demonstrates, has made great strides. The cost of this form of schooling has to be borne mainly by small poverty-stricken villages, whose inhabitants are largely illiterate. Mr. Tannenbaum points with pride to the great advance made by labor, but fails to mention the fact that labor organizations exist chiefly in the few large cities and that peonage, although not given official sanction, still has a menacing foothold. The text, sometimes soggy, is leavened by the drawings of Miguel Covarrubias, which in this case are vastly more *sympatico* than most of this Mexican artist's work.

Fiction

JACK ROBINSON, by George Beaton. *New York: The Viking Press. $2.50.*

This is the story of an English lad's adventures among the oddities and outcasts of Victorian industrialism. Jack runs away from home with a map of South America, a copy of "Swiss Family Robinson" and twelve shillings sixpence in his pocket. On the second day out, he falls into the clutches of the Cheeser, a remarkable old tramp, who keeps Jack in terror of his life until he escapes—much the wiser in matters of begging, thieving and foraging in general. His next master is also a tramp, but one whose specialty is preaching the doctrine of the Universal Spirit and fraudulently living on the hospitality of others. Jack's endurance of Brother Kelly soon ends, and now he resolves to become a tramp in his own right. He entertains queer notions of what constitutes happiness, among them the privilege of sharing his lot with the wretched. But when their misfortunes overtake him, he rebels—and at the same time relapses into a physical apathy which encourages a morbid day-dreaming orgy. This portion of the book seems to command most of the author's interest. From a swiftly moving narrative "Jack Robinson" changes to a treatise on introspection—thus, the subtitle, "an adventure in two worlds." The book is irritating because the reader can't help feeling that it ought to be better than it is. The author has tried a difficult experiment and it hasn't come off.

Contributors

JONATHAN MITCHELL, former newspaper man and author of "Goose Steps to Peace," has been observing the N.R.A. meetings in Washington, as his article indicates.

WILLIAM P. MANGOLD, formerly member of the staff of The Nation, is an industrial and labor-research expert now living in New York City. He is a frequent contributor to business papers.

VALENTINE ACKLAND, an English poet, is co-author with Sylvia Townsend Warner of a collection of verse, "Whether a Dove or a Seagull," published last October by The Viking Press.

PHILIP WHEELWRIGHT is professor of Philosophy at New York University. He has recently retired as editor of The Symposium.

GEORGE E. NOVACK recently resigned from the staff of E. P. Dutton and Company and is working on a history of American philosophy since the Civil War.

SIDNEY HOOK, assistant professor of Philosophy at New York University and lecturer at the New School for Social Research, is the author of "Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx." He is now at work upon a social study, "From Hegel to Marx."

FRED T. MARSH is a free-lance writer living in New York City. He contributes frequent reviews to The New York Herald Tribune Books.

HAROLD WARD makes a specialty of the social implications of science and technology. He writes on "Science and Society" for The Living Age.

DAVID BERES is a practising physician in New York City and Crestwood, New York. He has contributed reviews to scientific journals and to The Nation.

The initials signed to the brief reviews are those of Paul Schofield and Newton Arvin.

LECTURES

THE PEOPLE'S INSTITUTE
AT COOPER UNION
8th Street and Astor Place, at 8 o'clock
Admission Free

Sunday, March 18th
PROFESSOR LINDSAY ROGERS
"Crisis Government—1934 Model"

Tuesday, March 20th
PROFESSOR EDWARD KASNER
"Mathematics and Physics"

Friday, March 23rd
EVERETT DEAN MARTIN
"The Reactionary Revolutions in Italy and Germany"

Tuesday Eve., MARCH 20 at 8:30 P. M.
THEODORE DREISER
speaks on:
"WHAT HOPE AMERICA?"
at THE GROUP, 150 West 85th Street
Admission 50c — Notices on Request

TRAVEL

RUSSIAN SEMINAR $345
July-August, 1934. Itinerary includes Leningrad, Moscow, Volga Cruise, Donbas, Georgian Military Highway, Trans-Caucasia, Black Sea Cruise, Ukraine, Dneiprostroi, Crimea. England, Denmark, Finland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Turkey, Greece, Italy, France, Italy visited enroute. Complete tour $595. Expert leadership. Round-table discussions with Soviet leaders. Organized on non-profit basis.
Write for announcement.
BUREAU OF UNIVERSITY TRAVEL
Box J-26 Newton, Mass.

THEATRE

THE THEATRE GUILD presents
JOHN WEXLEY'S play
THEY SHALL NOT DIE
ROYALE THEATRE, 45 St., W. of B'way. Eves. 8:20. Mat. Thursday & Saturday, 2:20.
MONDAY, MARCH 26th
Scottsboro Defense Benefit
Buy tickets at the box office or from the
National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners
156 Fifth Avenue, (20th Street, Room 534.)

BOOKS

Re-Discovering AMERICA
by
Harold E. Stearns
A brilliant and serious study by a prodigal American who returns to his homeland after 13 years self-imposed exile! Penetrating — albeit friendly and pleasant! America as an American sees it! Distinctly worth-while!
$2
GIRLS RADIO MUSIC POETRY HARLEM HORSES RELIGION DEMOCRACY
Liveright Pub. Corp.
386 4th Ave. N. Y. C.

GENERAL

CONSUMERS' DEFENDER — Present hosiery to auto tires, tooth brushes to olive oil, a whole alphabet of specification products for the consumers' protection by a non-profit mail-order cooperative. Send 10c. Cooperative Distributors, Inc., 30 Irving Place, New York City.

PAINTINGS

THE TEN DOLLAR GALLERY
28 East 56th Street, N. Y.
small oil paintings and water colors by
EILSHEMIUS
group show of water colors, oils, lithographs by FERSTADT, PRESSOIR, NAGAI, DEHN, FRUHAUF
El. 5-3462 10—6 daily

FOR RENT

For rent, furnished, first floor semi-bungalow, six rooms; open porch, garage. Beginning April 1st. Desirable suburb, Westchester County. Address: Box 811, The New Republic.

RESTAURANT

Where RUSSIAN Hospitality Greets You Warmly . . .
SAMOVAR
Dance — with a Russian Orchestra. Entertainment—with gifted artists.
Vodka, like nectar. Other liquors. Strange but true: Good food—moderate. 142 W. 49 St., BR 9-0883

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED